



TRUTH ABOUT AHMADIYYAT

B.A. Rafiq

Contents

Introduction

Ahmadiyyat and the British

Ahmadis and the State of Israel

Jesus of the Gospels

Finality of Prophethood

Claim of the Promised Messiah

The Opponents of the Promised Messiah

Reflection of All the Prophets

Suspension of Jihad

Prophecy Relating to Muhammadi Begum

Health of the Promised Messiah

Challenge to Maulvi Sanaullah

Prayer Services Led by a Non-Ahmadi Muslim

The Establishment of a Heavenly Graveyard

Introduction

Ever since God Almighty has instituted the system of prophethood for the guidance of mankind, the opponents of these holy prophets, peace be on them, have always charged them with falsehood and untruth. They were called sorcerers and madmen and were described as disorderly and rebellious. Every prophet and God's elect was treated in that manner. The same was the case with the Promised Messiah, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, peace be on him. when he put forth his claim of being the Reformer of the age and the Promised Mehdi, not only Muslim divines, but the leaders of other religions also, rose up against him and assailed him with false charges and insupportable objections. Muslim divines proclaimed that his teaching was opposed to Islam and the practice of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and showered false charges upon him. These were the vicious divines concerning whom our Lord and master, Hazrat Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had prophesied thirteen hundred years in advance that is:

The Muslim divines of the latter days would be the worst of creation under heaven (*Mishkat, Kitabul Ilm*).

Many eminent Muslim saints had predicted that the Mehdi would be opposed bitterly by the Muslim divines.

1. The Reformer of the second millennium, may Allah have mercy on him, wrote, concerning the Mehdi:

It is most likely that the superficial divines would reject him and would regard him as opposed to the Holy Book and the practice of the Holy Prophet. (*Maktoobat Imam Rabbani*, Vol. 11, p. 55)

The same will be the case of the Mehdi, peace be on him. All the *muqallids* will become his bitter enemies and will conspire to assassinate him, alleging that he is corrupting their faith. (*Iqtrabas Saat*, p. 244)

2. Hazrat Shaikh Mohyuddin ibn Arabi recorded:

When Imam Mehdi appears the divines and the jurists will be his bitter enemies. (*Futuhati Makkiyyah*, Vol. 11, p. 242)

3. Nawab Siddique Hasan khan wrote:

When the Mehdi, peace be on him, starts his campaign for the revival of the practice of the Holy Prophet, and to put down innovations, the contemporary divines, who are committed to following the jurists and are devoted to their leading men of the past and to their ancestors, will say that he seeks to ruin their faith and the Muslim community. They will rise up in opposition to him and according to their custom they will declare him a disbeliever. (*Hujajul Karamah*, p. 363)

Thus it is clear that the treatment accorded to the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, by the superficial divines was in exact accord with the prophecies of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and of Muslim saints and with the practice of the opponents of previous prophets. Their opposition and their false statements proved them to be the vicious divines against whom the Holy Prophet had warned the Muslims and also confirmed the truth of the Promised Messiah.

It is a fact that the charges that were put forward against the Promised Messiah, peace be upon him, by his opponents, were of the same type as had been put forward against previous prophets by their opponents. The Holy Quran states:

Nothing is urged against thee but that which was urged against the Messengers before thee. (41:44)

Then why do not the opponents of Ahmadiyyat judge the Promised Messiah, peace be upon him, by the same standard that they apply to the previous prophets, and why do they urge against him the very objections that were urged against them? The fundamental fact is that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, claimed to be the Mehdi in accord with the prophecies of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. If his claim was true the objections raised against him must be false and untrue; but if his claim was not true then it would not be necessary to investigate the charges made against him. Therefore, it would be more appropriate for a seeker after truth, instead of becoming involved with the objections raised against him, to investigate whether Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, peace be on him, was or was not true in his claim. Once his truth is established all objections raised against him become irrelevant.

To investigate his claim we should keep in mind the principles that the Holy Quran has laid down with reference to the truth of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. Accordingly, to start with, we would draw attention to the following verses of the Holy Quran:

Tell them: Had Allah so willed, I would not have recited the Holy Quran to you nor would Allah have made it known to you. I have spent a whole lifetime among you before this. Will you not, then, understand? (10:17)

This verse affirms that Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, was righteous in his claim and that the proof thereof is that before claiming to be a prophet he had lived for a long time among those who were now his opponents and if before

his claim to prophethood at forty years of age he had to their knowledge been righteous and truthful and had never been guilty of falsehood or imposture, then how was it possible that he would suddenly invent a great lie against God Almighty? Applying this standard to Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, we discover that according to the testimony of friend and foe alike, his life, before he put forward his claim, was absolutely pure and stainless. After he put forward his claim of being the Mehdi his principal opponent was Maulvi Muhammad Husain of Batala who left no stone unturned in opposing him. He had known Hazrat Ahmad since his childhood and had been his class-fellow. Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad wrote his epoch-making book *Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya* in 1879. At that time he had not put forward any claim. He announced his claim in January 1889. In the course of a review of *Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya*, Maulvi Muhammad Husain wrote as follows:

The author of this book has proved his devotion to Islam by such help with money, life, pen, tongue, conduct and writings, the like of which has seldom been found among the Muslims ... The author belongs to our neighborhood and in our early life when we were studying *Qutbi* and *Sharah Mulla*, he was our class-fellow. Ever since then we have been continuously in touch with each other through correspondence and meetings. Therefore, it is no exaggeration to affirm that we are intimately acquainted with his circumstances and ideas ... The author of *Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya* has upheld the honor of the Muslims. (*Ishaatus Sunnah*, Vol. VII)

Hazrat Sufi Ahmad Jan of Ludhiana, who was a spiritual preceptor having thousand of followers and who had died before the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, had put forward his claim, stated:

The Mirza Sahib is about forty or fifty-five years of age. The original home of his ancestors appears to have been Iran. He is extremely courteous, is beneficent and modest, is handsome and his countenance displays his love of the Divine. I state it most honestly and with complete truthfulness that without the least doubt the Mirza Sahib is the Reformer of the Age, and is a sun for the seekers of the way, and is a *Khizar* for the misguided, and is a sharp sword for the opponents of Islam and is a conclusive proof for the envious. Be sure that such a time will not recur. Be warned that the time of trial has arrived and divine proof has been established and a perfect guide has been sent with conclusive arguments, bright as the sun, so that he might bestow light upon the truthful ones and lead them out of darkness and error and confound the false ones. (*Tassurate Qadian*, p. 69)

Maulvi Sirajuddin, father of Maulvi Zaffar Ali Khan, editor of the *Zamindar*, stated:

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Sahib was a clerk in Sialkot about 1860 or 1861. At that time he would have been twenty-two or twenty-three years of age. I testify as an eye-witness that in his youth he was most righteous, pious and exalted. (*Zamindar*, 8 June 1908)

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, challenged his opponents in respect of the purity of his life in the following words:

You cannot point to any defect or imposture or falsehood or deceit in my early life on the basis of which you might hold that a person who had been given to falsehood and imposture has put forward his claim falsely. Is there anyone from among you who can point to any fault in my

life? It is the pure grace of God that from the beginning He kept me firm in righteousness and this is a proof for those who reflect. (*Tazkaratus Shahadatain*, p. 62)

Before his claim also he led a pure life and was truthful and enjoyed communion with God. Every fibre of his being was devoted to God. Then how was it to be expected that in putting forward his claim he would invent such a great lie against God Almighty that He speaks to him and disclosed to him part of the unseen?

Another criterion of the righteousness of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, is put forward in the Holy Quran in the following words:

If he had fabricated any saying and attributed it to Us, We would surely have seized him by the right hand, then surely We would have severed his large artery, and not one of you could have kept Us from it. (69:45-48)

This means that if the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had (God save us) been guilty of inventing a falsehood against God, he would have been destroyed by God. In other words, an impostor is frustrated in his purposes and is soon destroyed and suffers torment. On the same basis of these verses there has been a consensus in Islam that an impostor cannot survive for twenty-three years after putting forward his claim of being a recipient of revelation. When we apply this criterion to the life of the Promised Messiah we find that he was a prophet of high resolve and was highly successful and that the Movement founded by him has flourished continuously in the world. He enjoyed Divine help throughout. He was alone and was given a devoted Community. He was poor and helpless and God Almighty enriched him. He was unknown and God Almighty made him known to the ends of the earth. Every day of his life augmented

his blessings and carried him forward. Has not his truth then been established according to the Quiranic criterion that we have just set out? Had he been an impostor, God Almighty, in accordance with that criterion, would have destroyed him utterly. But what happened was the reverse of it and is a clear proof of his truth.

We would draw attention to an earnest Supplication of his which he expressed in Persian verse as follows:

O Almighty God,
Creator of heaven and earth,
Merciful, Compassionate and Guide,
Who looks into the hearts and from Whom nothing is hidden,
If Thou seest me full of disobedience and mischief;
If in Thy estimation I am an ill-fated creature,
Then do Thou break into pieces this vile one and give pleasure to my enemies.
Shower Thy blessings upon them and fulfil all their designs by Thy grace.
Cast a flame of fire on my household,
Be my enemy and ruin my enterprise.
But if Thou knowest that I am of Thy sincere servants And
Thy threshold is my *qibla*,
And Thou findest that my heart is flooded with such love for Thee as is hidden from the rest of the world,
Then deal with me out of love and disclose somewhat of these mysteries. (*Haqeeqatul Mahdi*, p. 1)

Could an impostor stand before God and supplicate Him in these moving terms? Keep them in the forefront of your minds and then observe the limitless support and help that God Almighty bestowed upon him, which is overwhelming proof of his truth. Thus while he flourished and went ever forward, anyone who put

himself in opposition to him and challenged his claim was destroyed and ruined. This alone is sufficient proof of his truth.

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, states:

Seldom does a night pass in which God does not comfort me with the assurance that He is with me and that His heavenly hosts stand in my support. Those who are pure in heart will see God after death, but I call His countenance to witness that I see Him even now. The world does not recognize me but He Who has sent me knows me. It is a mistake of my opponents and it is their misfortune that they desire my ruin. I am a tree that the True Master has planted with His own hand. He who seeks to cut me down merely makes himself an heir to Korah, Judas Iscariot, and Abu Jahl. I daily desire it with tears that someone should come into the field and should seek a decision with regard to me on the criteria of prophethood and thus find out which of us enjoys divine support. But to come into the field is not the business of anyone who lacks manhood. One Ghulam Dastagir who was a combatant of the disbelieving host in the Punjab came forward and suffered ruin. It is now impossible for even one like him to come forth from among them. O ye people! Be sure that I am supported by the Hand that will keep faith with me till the end. If your men and your women, and your youths and your old ones, and your little ones and your elders, all combine and occupy themselves with supplications begging my ruin, so much so that through long and frequent prostration's their noses should be rubbed away and their hands should be palsied, even then God will not hear your supplications and will not withdraw His hand till He fulfills His design. If no one from among men should be with me, God's

angels will stand with me. If you conceal your testimony, stones would well-nigh bear witness for me. Then do not wrong your souls. Those who are false exhibit one type of countenance and those who are true exhibit another. God does not leave any matter undetermined. I call a curse on a life that is given to falsehood and imposture. (*Zameenah Tohfa Golarviak*, p. 49)

Dare an impostor express himself in such emphatic and powerful words?

Another criterion that the Holy Quran has put forth for judging the truth of a prophet is:

He is the Knower of the unseen; and He reveals not the unseen to anyone, except to him whom He chooses from among His Messengers. (72:27-28)

This means that a prophet is bestowed knowledge of the unseen through revelation to the degree determined by God, and he prophesies accordingly. His prophecies are not open to doubt; they are certain and conclusive and they are all fulfilled without exception. They reveal a good deal of the unseen and are evidence of the support and help of God.

This criterion also establishes the truth of the Promised Messiah. He disclosed a good deal of the unseen, hundreds of his prophecies were fulfilled during his lifetime, many have been fulfilled since and many await fulfillment. It is not possible within the space of this booklet to set them out in detail. For that it is necessary to study his books. By way of illustration we mention some of them here.

At a time when there was intense opposition to him and he was the subject of attack from all directions, not only Muslim divines,

but also Christians and Arya Samajists were all active in opposition to him, and it appeared that his mission was likely to be frustrated, he wrote:

Hearken, all of you! This is a prophecy of Him Who has created the heavens and the earth that He will spread this Community in all regions and will make it supreme over all through arguments and proofs... The days are coming, indeed that are near, when there will be only one religion that is honored in the world. He will bless this Movement abundantly and will frustrate everyone who seeks to destroy it. This supremacy will endure forever till the Judgment is held. (*Tazkaratus Shahadatain*, p. 64)

In **1891** he received the revelation:

I shall make thee known with honor to the ends of the earth and shall exalt thy name.

At the time when he received this revelation he had sent no missionaries outside India, nor were his books generally known beyond the confines of India. Today the message of Ahmadiyyat has reached the farthest regions of the earth. Ahmadiyya missions have been established in most countries of the world and Ahmadi missionaries are scattered around the globe. Islam which appeared in his time as fighting a rearguard action against Christianity is, through his tremendous efforts, now looked upon again with honor and respect in contrast with other religions, and Christianity is on the retreat. It is a matter for reflection what was the power which, many years ago at a time of great weakness and utter helplessness, caused him to make these predictions of Islamic victories and has fulfilled them? Is there any instance of a false one making such prophecies which were fulfilled so splendidly? God Almighty never lends His support to

one who is false. As the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has said:

An impure person never receives help from the Divine Master and He never lets His pure servants be frustrated.

The Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had announced a definite sign about the advent of the Mehdi. He had said:

The truth of our Mehdi will be attested by two signs which have never appeared in support of any other claimant since the beginning of the world. These are that in the month of Ramadhan the moon will be eclipsed during the first of the nights during which it is subjected to an eclipse and the sun will be eclipsed on the middle one of the days during which it is subject to an eclipse. (*Dar Qutni*, Vol. I, p. 188)

This prophecy was fulfilled very clearly in 1894. In the month of Ramadhan of that year the moon was eclipsed on the night of 13th, which is the first of the nights on which it suffers an eclipse, and in the same month the sun was eclipsed on the 28th of the month, which is the middle one of the days on which the sun is liable to an eclipse. This Sign was exhibited in India and other Asiatic countries and it was exhibited in America in exactly the same way in the following year on the dates specified in the *hadees*. This sign was fulfilled so clearly that no one has raised any objection or doubt concerning it. The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has drawn attention to it most emphatically.

The Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had proclaimed that God Almighty would at the beginning of every

century raise a Reformer from among the Muslims who would revive the faith (*Abu Daud*, Vol. 11, p. 241; *Mishkat, Kitabul Ilm*).

This has been acknowledged unanimously by Muslim divines throughout. The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, appeared at the beginning of the 14th century of Islam and announced his claim that he was a Reformer and the Promised Mahdi. The 14th century is now drawing to a close and no other reformer has made his appearance among the Muslims in the course of the century. If he is not accepted as a Divinely appointed Reformer, the prediction of the Holy Prophet, peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him, would (God save us) be falsified. As the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has said:

The time demanded the Messiah and no one else. Had I not come, someone else would have come in my place.

We would urge the Muslims not to be guilty of denying the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, by denying the Promised Messiah, peace be on him.

There are hundreds of proofs that can be cited in support of the truth of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, but we have, out of considerations of space, restricted ourselves to only a few by way of illustration.

We pray that God Almighty might bestow upon our non Ahmadi brethren the insight to recognise the truth and might enable them to become true Muslims and believers by accepting the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, in whose advent were fulfilled the prophecies of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. Amen.

Ahmadiyyat and the British

An objection that is raised is that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement described himself as a tree planted by the British and that he flattered the British and praised them unduly, which shows that his claim to prophethood had been sponsored by the British.

This charge is entirely false. The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, used the expression 'a tree planted by the British' concerning his forebears with reference to the services rendered by them to the British. He has not employed this expression anywhere concerning his claim, or his status. He wrote:

It is not possible to silence those people who seek to cover up the devoted services rendered by my father, Mirza Ghulam Murtaza, and my brother, Mirza Ghulam Qadir, extending over half a century, which are mentioned in Government letters and in Sir Leppel Griffin's book *Chiefs of the Punjab*, and the service rendered in my writings extending over eighteen years and to create a misunderstanding in the minds of the British authorities and to raise a doubt concerning a family that has been loyal to the Government and has wished it well. Some people are determined to convey to the Government false allegations on account of religious differences; or out of jealousy, or spite, or some personal motive. It is requested that the authorities should act with wisdom and caution and after due investigation and attention towards a family whose loyalty and devotion have been well established and concerning whom high officials of Government have always expressed the view in their letters that its members are the well wishers and loyal

servants of the British Government and which is a tree planted by itself. (*Tableegh Risalat*, Vol. VII, pp. 19-20)

It is quite clear that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, did not describe his claim as 'a tree planted by the Government', but has used this expression concerning the services rendered by the members of his family and himself in the past. Concerning his claim, he had recorded in the same letter addressed to the Lieutenant Governor:

I claim to be the Promised Messiah under Divine behest and having been honored by Divine revelation and inspiration.

With regard to his own advent he announced emphatically that he was a tree planted by the hand of God Almighty. He wrote:

I am not a tree that can be uprooted by them. If their first ones and their last ones, and their living ones and their dead ones, should all combine together and should pray for my death, my God would reject all their prayers and would throw them back at them as a curse. (*Arbain*, Nos. 4-7)

In a Persian verse he has said:

O thou who runnest towards me with a hundred hatchets!
Have fear of the gardener,
For I am a fruit-bearing branch!

It can be asked why did he in any case express his loyalty and praised the British repeatedly in his books? The answer is that some people continuously reported to the Government that he was a dangerous person, even more dangerous than the Sudanese Mahdi. For instance, Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Sahib of Batala wrote concerning him:

His deception is proved by the fact that in his heart he considers it lawful to put an end to the authority of a non-Muslim government and to plunder its belongings ... Therefore, it would not be proper on the part of the Government to rely on him and it would be necessary to beware of him, otherwise such harm might be suffered at the hands of this Mahdi of Qadian as was experienced at the hands of the Sudanese Mahdi. (*Ishaatus Sunnah*, Vol. VI, 1893)

To counter this propaganda, he had to state time after time in books that his community was loyal to the British Government.

Regarding the charge that he flattered the British, attention might be drawn to some of his writings. For instance, he says:

Some ignorant people have raised the objection, among them the Editor of *Al-Manar*, that as I live in a country ruled by the British, I, therefore, forbid Jihad. These stupid ones do not consider that if I had wished to please the Government with false declarations, why should I have affirmed repeatedly that Jesus, son of Mary, was delivered from the cross and died a natural death in Srinagar and that he was neither God, nor Son of God. Would not such of the British who are devoted to their religion be disgusted by this affirmation of mine? Then attend to this, ye stupid ones, that I offer no flattery to this Government. The truth is that according to the Holy Quran, it is forbidden to go to war against a government which does not interfere in any way with Islam or its practice, nor uses force against us in order to promote its own religion. (*Kishti Nuh*, p. 68)

He states further:

This Government safeguards the lives and the properties of the Muslims and provides them with security against the attack of every wrongdoer... I have not embarked upon this enterprise out of any fear of Government or in the hope of any reward from it. All I have done is in accordance with the divine command and the command of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. (*Nurul Haq*, Part I, p. 30)

He also states:

I have never desired that I should mention my continuous services to government officials, for I consider it my duty to declare the truth, not out of my desire for any return or award. (*Tableegh Risalat*, Vol. VII, p. 10)

Another statement of his is:

I do not flatter the Government as some ignorant ones imagine because I desire a return from the Government. On the contrary, I consider it just and a duty on account of my faith to express gratitude to the Government. (*Tableegh Risalat*, Vol. X, p. 123)

Thus, whenever he praised the British, it was not out of flattery but was out of obedience to the direction of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, that he who is not grateful to man is not grateful to Allah. To call a justice-loving government a just government is an Islamic quality and is not open to objection.

It is surprising that when the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, pointed out some of the good qualities of the British he was charged with flattering them, but when numberless Muslim divines, both those who were his contemporaries and those who

came after him, praised the British in exaggerated terms, no one raised a voice against it. Is that Islamic justice?

We set out below, by way of illustration, some of the declarations of Muslim divines and leaders who described the British Government as a divine blessing.

1. Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Sahib of Batala, who was one of the divines and leaders of the Ahle Hadees, wrote:

It is not permissible for Muslim subjects to fight, or to help with men and money those who fight, against a government, whether Christian, or Jewish, or of some other faith, under whom the Muslims carry out their religious duties and obligations freely. For the Muslims of India it is forbidden to oppose or rebel against the British Government. (*Ishaatus Sunnah*, Vol. VI, No. 10)

He has also stated:

Brethren, this is not the time of the sword; at this time it has become necessary to use the pen in place of the sword. (*Ishaatus Sunnah*, Vol. VI, No. 12)

2. Syed Ali-al-Hairi Sahib, the well-known Shia mujtahid, has stated:

We take pride in being subject to a Government under which justice and religious freedom are the law, the equal of which is not to be found in any other government of the world. Therefore, I declare that in return for this beneficence every Shia should be grateful to the British Government with a sincere heart and appreciate its beneficence. (*Mauiza Tahreef Quran*, April 1923)

3. Hazrat Syed Sahib Brelvi declared:

Our true purpose is the propagation of the Unity of God and the revival of the practice of the Chiefs of the Prophets, and that we carry out without hindrance in this country. Then why should we fight the British Government and shed the blood of both sides contrary to the principles of our religion. (*Biography of Hazrat Syed Ahmed* by Maulana Muhammad Jaafar Thanedar)

4. *An-Nadwah*, the organ of the Nadwatul Ulama, wrote:

The true purpose of this institute of learning is to produce clear-minded divines and it is the duty of such divines that they should be familiar with the blessings of the Government and should propagate loyalty to the Government in the country. (*An-Nadwah*, Vol. V, July 1908)

Again, the same organ wrote:

One day was observed as a holiday in celebration of the fifty years' Jubilee of the British Government and a telegram of felicitations was dispatched on behalf of the Nadwah to His Excellency the Governor-General. (*An-Nadwah*, November, 1908)

It is against this background that the Promised Messiah expressed his gratitude to the British Government. He set forth his reasons thus:

The Government has provided freedom for every people to propagate their religion and thus the people have gained the opportunity to investigate and reflect upon the principles of each religion and the arguments in support of them ... That is the reason that we mention the

beneficence of the British Government repeatedly in our writings and speeches. (*Roedad Jalsa Dua*)

Many of the Muslim divines and leaders obtained grants and awards from the British Government in return for their praise of the Government and their service to it. The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, did all this for the purpose of the propagation of the true Islamic teaching and sought or obtained no advantage of any kind from the British Government. Can the opposing Muslim divines point to a single instance in which the British Government conferred any benefit upon him in return for his praise of the Government? There is no such instance. He was a resident of Qadian and during his lifetime no facility, like the telegraph, or telephone, or railways, was provided by the Government. He lived in perpetual danger on account of the provocative writings and speeches of the opposing divines, but the Government never took any step towards his security, nor rendered him any financial assistance. There was no police or military unit in Qadian. He was repeatedly prosecuted on false charges but the Government showed him no favor. Would that be the attitude of a government towards one who, as has been alleged, was put up by government and was its spy?

When the Promised Messiah, peace be upon him, put forward his claim, the opposing divines for many years continued to charge him with being the agent of the Government and on the other hand reported to the Government that he was disloyal and intended to bring about a rebellion.

On one occasion he received a revelation in Persian to the effect that the British Empire would last only for eight years and that thereafter a period of weakness and disorder and decline would set in. He communicated this revelation only to some members of his Movement. When Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Sahib of Batala, who was always in search for something on the basis of which he

might be able to establish that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, was disloyal to and a rebel against the British Government, learnt of this revelation from a member of the Movement, he at once wrote an article justifying his assertion that he was a rebel who desired to bring about the end of the British Government and Empire.

In any case, is it not surprising that a person who, according to his opponents, had been put up by the British Government should convey to his followers that the days of that Government had been numbered? Had he been put up by the British he would have propagated in support of the strength and permanence of the Government rather than make a prophecy that the Government would not last for much longer.

Another matter that is worthy of note is that the British Government spent millions of pounds in the effort to establish Christianity in its colonial possessions. They published a vast literature in support of this effort and helped to train thousands of missionaries for that purpose. Under the auspices of the Bible Religious Society millions of copies of the Bible were printed in local languages and were published freely and nothing was left untried for the propagation of Christianity and its firm establishment. Then does it stand to reason that on the one hand an intelligent Government should carry on such a tremendous effort for the propagation of its religion and on the other hand should put up a person who applied the ax to the roots of Christianity? Christianity is founded on the death of Jesus upon the cross whereby, it is alleged, he atoned for the sins of mankind. The Promised Messiah, peace be upon him, proved that Jesus did not die upon the cross and thus demolished the very foundation of Christianity. He challenged the principal Christian missionaries in India and established their falsehood. Can such a person be the agent of a Christian government?

All Christian missionaries were united in their opposition to the Promised Messiah, peace be on him. If they knew that he was one of their own men, why should they have opposed him so strenuously? One of his well-known Christian opponents was Padre Thakurdas, He wrote and published books like the *Review of Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya*, *Izalatul Mirza Qadiani*, *Zunub Muhammadjyya*, against the Ahmadiyya Movement. Padre S. P. Jacob wrote and published a book against him called *The Promised Messiah*. The Rev. Dr. Griswold wrote and published a book titled *Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadiani* against him. Leading missionaries like Fateh Masih, Waris Masih, Imadud-din, Sirajuddin, Abdullah Atham, and Henry Martyn Clark, worked their utmost in their Opposition to him. Abdullah Atham was an Extra Assistant Commissioner. If the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, had been put up by the British, was it for them to instruct one of their senior officers to oppose him? Dr. Henry Martyn Clark instituted a false prosecution against him charging him with conspiracy to murder. Was this the type of treatment which was to be expected from the Christians against an agent of the Government?

Till two years before his death the name of every visitor to Qadian was noted down by police agents. Most of the leading British officials looked upon the Ahmadiyya Community with suspicion and were opposed to it. The Governor of the Punjab, Sir Herbert Emerson, was well-known for his hostility towards the Ahmadiyya Movement. He encouraged the *Ahrar* in their Opposition to the Movement and backed them up. Does all this show whether the British officials were the friends of the Ahmadis or were opposed to them?

The Opponents of the Ahmadiyya Movement describe as an agent of the Christian British Government, one who dubbed Christian

missionaries as Anti-Christ (*Chashmai-Maarifat*), and who proclaimed:

All Christians are without faith and as such they have no right to argue with anyone in the matter of faith, until they first prove their own faithfulness. Their condition bears witness that on account of the lack of those qualities which Jesus prescribed as the qualities of faith, either they are without faith or he was false who set down such qualities for them which are not found in them. In either case it is established that the Christians are utterly far away from and are deprived of truth. (*Karamatus Sadiqeen*, p. 55)

Can one who wrote this be an agent of the British Government? The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, was the person who blocked the advance of Christianity, who proved the death of the god of the Christians, who established the truth of the Holy Quran in contrast with the Bible, whose missionaries are busy demolishing Christian citadels around the globe and who invited the Queen of Great Britain, who was the greatest sovereign of her age, to give up Christianity and to accept Islam. Addressing her he said:

Honored Queen and Empress of India, with humble respect we submit that in this time of joy, which is the time of your Diamond Jubilee, you should endeavor ... to rescue the honor of Jesus from the stain that has been put upon it. (*Tohfa Qaisariyah*)

Can any reasonable person accept that one who had been put up, as alleged by his opponents, by a Christian Government to uproot Islam, should stand up and invite the mightiest sovereign of his time, Her Majesty Queen Victoria, to accept Islam?

Ahmadis and the State of Israel

Now that British rule has been brought to an end, the opponents of Ahmadiyyat have invented a new charge that the Ahmadis are the agents of Israel.

In this context it is worthy of note that the first voice raised against the establishment of Israel was the voice of the Ahmadiyya Community, yet its opponents feel no compunction in charging it with being the agents of Israel. When the question of Palestine was raised in the United Nations, Chaudhry Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, a devoted Ahmadi, was enabled by divine grace to deliver a powerful speech on 9 October 1947 in the Committee of the United Nations Assembly that was dealing with the problem, in which he put forward the case of the Palestine Arabs with great ability. The *Nawai Waqt* of October 12 1947 commented:

The special correspondence of Reuter has reported that after the speech of Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, the Pakistani delegate, the Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations dealing with the question has been confronted with an awkward situation. Till the delegation of the United States declares its position with reference to the problem, other delegations are not prepared to speak. The United States delegate is not ready to speak till President Truman and the Secretary of State, Mr. George Marshall, and the U.S. delegation itself agree upon a united stand. The Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Herbert Evatt, of Australia, expressed his uneasiness at the debate appearing to have arrived prematurely at its end. The U.S. delegate remained sitting silent as if his lips had been sealed. Such a situation is unprecedented in the United Nations. The

Pakistani delegate expressed the view of other delegations when in his annoyance he suggested that as leading delegates were reluctant to speak the general debate on the question of Palestine might be closed.

The same organ wrote:

The speech delivered by Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, leader of the Pakistan delegation, in the Committee of the UN General Assembly on the question of Palestine was most outstanding in every respect. He spoke for one hundred and fifteen minutes. When he finished his speech an Arab representative said that this was the best speech on the case of the Arabs and that he had not so far heard any such outstanding statement of their case.

Muhammad Zafrulla Khan devoted the greater part of his speech to arguing against the partition of Palestine. During the course of his speech the faces of Arab representatives shone with pleasure. At the end of the speech the delegates of Arab countries shook him by the hand and felicitated him on his glorious speech. A British delegate sent a message to Zafrulla Khan that his speech was outstanding and that he would request to be furnished with a copy of it so that he might study it with great care.

This historic speech of Ch. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan presented the true aspects of the problem of Palestine before the United Nations and the delegations of several member countries made up their minds in pursuance of it to vote against the partition of Palestine, but thereafter some of them changed their minds under pressure from the great powers.

On 9 December 1947, Ch. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan delivered an address on the subject of Palestine in the Government College

Lahore which was reported in the *Nawai Waqt* of 11 December in the following terms:

Ch. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, leader of the Pakistan delegation to the Assembly of the United Nations, spoke at length on all aspects of the problem of Palestine. He condemned the resolution of the UN General Assembly recommending the partition of Palestine as entirely unjust. Speaking at the Government College Lahore, he expressed great regret that the United States Government procured the recommendation of the United Nations in support of the partition of Palestine by exercising undue pressure on some of the small Powers, members of the United Nations. He said that Palestine had been made a pawn in the election politics of the United States. He pointed out that in the proposed Jewish State to be set up in Palestine, not only will a large Arab minority be subjected to Jewish domination but the economy of the country will pass under international control which would be an illegal development.

He explained that on 26 November it was certain that the resolution could not be carried and its supporters were convinced that it would be defeated) but that at the last moment the voting was unnecessarily postponed to 28 November so that pressure could be exercised on some of the member states that they should give up their opposition to the resolution and vote in support of it. He mentioned that on 28 November the representative of Haiti met him after the voting and with tears literally running down his cheeks made his apology that he had not been left free to vote in accordance with his original instructions. Several other delegates confessed that they had been compelled to vote in support of the resolution under great pressure.

In view of the powerful advocacy of the Arab cause by Ch. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, not only on this occasion but on every occasion when the question was subsequently raised in the United Nations, can any just person charge the Ahmadiyya Community with being the agents of Israel?

The problem of Palestine entered on a new phase after 1 December 1947 when, through the joint efforts of the United States and the USSR, the General Assembly most unjustly adopted its resolution recommending partition of Palestine. Hazrat Mirza Bashirud Din Mahmud Ahmad Sahib, Khalifatul Masih II, Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement, wrote two strong articles revealing the background of the partition of Palestine. The first of these was published on 28 November and the second on 11 December 1947. In these articles he established clearly that Jewish settlement in Palestine had been carried out under a conspiracy to which the USSR, USA and Britain were parties. He pointed out that these great powers appeared to be opposed to each other in pursuit of their political objectives but that they were united in their hostility towards the Muslims and that they had no sympathy with the Arabs and Muslims. He urged the Muslims to stand upon their own legs and that they should put forth every effort to do so.

These revolutionary articles of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II made a great stir in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and other Arab Countries. 'The Syrian radio broadcast a special summary of them and thus conveyed their purport to all corners of the Arab world. Leading Arab newspapers like the *Al-Yaum*, *Al-Akhbar*, *Al-Qabas*, *Al-Nasr*, *Sautul Ahrar* and *Al-Urdon* etc. published extracts of these articles and unanimously praised and upheld the stand of the writer.

In June 1948 Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II delivered an address in Lahore in which he strongly urged the Muslims to unite so as to rescue Palestine from the grip of the Zionists. With reference to

this address the *AI-Shura* of Baghdad in its issue of 8 June 1948 observed:

An Address by Mirza Mahmud Ahmad

We have received a tract which has been published in Baghdad in which a powerful address off Hazrat Mirza Mahmud Ahmad, Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Qadian, is set out which he delivered in Lahore after the setting up of the so-called State of Israel. This address is captioned 'The disbelievers are all one community'. We appreciate the Islamic indignation and Islamic efforts of the people who have published this very useful tract.

The *AI-Nahzah* of 12 July 1948 wrote:

We have received a tract which comprises an address of Al-Syed Mirza Mahmud Ahmad Sahib which he delivered in Lahore. In this address he has urged the Muslims to unite and has drawn attention to the need of solid and effective efforts towards rescuing Palestine from the grip of Zionist criminals and has asked the people of Pakistan to render immediate help to the Palestine Arabs. Reminding the Muslims of their common allegiance to the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and arguing from verses of the Holy Quran the speaker has urged them to organize themselves to with-stand the onsets of the Zionist criminals who are being supported by the United States and Communist Russia in pursuance of their interests and special purposes. He has asked the Muslims not to display weakness or distress, but to keep in mind their obligations of Jihad for the upholding of Islam and Muslims.

This is a passing glimpse of the great effort that the Head of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II and the devoted member of the Ahmadiyya Movement, Ch. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan, put forth in opposing the setting up of the State of Israel. Indeed the truth is that except the Ahmadiyya Community no one else did any solid work in this sphere. Yet, instead of appreciating this effort, our Pakistani Muslim brethren have charged us with being the agents of Israel. Is this Islamic justice? How will these people face God?

in this context one argument that is put forward by our opponents is that as the Ahmadiyya Movement maintains a missionary center in Israel, the Ahmadis are agents of Israel. If this has any substance in it then it is not only the Ahmadis who are to be blamed. Even today in Israel there are several hundred thousands of Muslims. They would also have to be declared agents of Israel. Then there are several Christian missions that are active in Israel. They will also have to be denounced as agents of Israel. The number of Ahmadis in Israel is very small in comparison with the number of Christians and other Muslims in Israel.

The fact is that the Ahmadiyya Mission in Palestine was established before the coming into existence of the State of Israel. At the time of partition it was decided by the Ahmadiyya Movement to continue its mission in Israel for the propagation of Islam and the education and training of the Palestinian Ahmadis who had been left in Israel along with other Muslims. The Ahmadis believe that it would be difficult to resolve the problem of Palestine satisfactorily in the end without converting all the Jews to Islam. Besides, it is the duty of all Muslims to present the message of Islam to every non-Muslim. In respect of the non-Muslim population of Palestine, the Ahmadis alone are discharging this obligation. The Holy Quran and the ahadees

nowhere forbid inviting the Jews to accept Islam or lay down that Muslims should not enter their territory for the purpose of informing them of the excellencies of Islam. It should be remembered that Islam is a universal faith and its message is addressed to all mankind alike. Under the directions of the Holy Quran, the Ahmadiyya Community carries out its obligation of propagating Islam all round the world including the State of Israel. This cannot be open to any objection.

The Holy Prophet, peace and blessing of Allah be upon him, addressed letters to Christian rulers, inviting them to accept Islam. He sent a delegation of Muslims to Ethiopia and directed them to settle there and carry on the propagation of Islam. The Ahmadiyya Community is following in the footsteps of its master, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. If for doing this they are described as disloyal and agents of the enemies of Islam they entertain no grievance about it.

Jesus of the Gospels

One objection that is raised against the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement is that he was disrespectful towards Hazrat Isa, peace be on him, and reviled him.

In this connection it should be clearly understood that one of the claims of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, was that he was the like of Hazrat Isa. He claimed that he had perfect spiritual resemblance to the Messiah. Then how is it possible that a person who claims to be the like of another and his reflection should defame him or should be disrespectful towards him, for that would amount to defaming himself, as the reflection must correspond to the original. It is, therefore contrary to reason that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, should have said anything derogatory concerning the Messiah, As he has said:

Claiming as I do, that I am the Promised Messiah and that I bear a resemblance to Hazrat Isa, peace be on him, every one would understand that were I to revile him, I would not claim any resemblance to him, for by reviling him, I would confess that I myself was vicious.
(*Announcement of 27 December 1898*)

In his books and writings, the Promised Messiah has repeatedly used expressions of honor, love and affection for Hazrat Isa. For instance he says:

1. There is no doubt that Hazrat Masih, peace be on him, was a true Prophet. (*Arbain*, No. 2)
2. I call Allah, the Glorious, to witness that in the revelation vouchsafed to me He has dearly informed me that Hazrat Masih, peace be on him, was without a doubt, a human being, like other human beings; that he was a true Prophet

of God and was His Messenger and His Elect. (*Hujjatul Islam*, p. 9)

3. It is my belief that the Messiah was a true Prophet and Messenger and was beloved of God but was not God. (*Hujjatul Islam*, p. 3)

4. Hazrat Isa, peace be on him, was, no doubt, a beloved Prophet of God and possessed the highest qualities. He was virtuous and a chosen one and had communion with God but was not God. (*Announcement of 22 March 1877*)

5. I have been commissioned by God Almighty to profess that Hazrat Isa, peace be on him, was a true and pure and righteous Prophet of God and to believe in his prophethood. (*Ayyamus Sulh*, first title page)

6. The Messiah was an accepted one of God and was beloved of Him. Those who utter calumnies against him are wicked. (*Ijaz Abmad*, p. 15)

7. I state on oath that I bear that true love towards the Messiah which you do not possess and that you have not available to you the light with which I recognize him. There is no doubt that he was a dear and chosen Prophet of God. (*Dawate Haq*, attached to *Haqeeqatul Wahi*)

This puts it beyond doubt that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, believed that Hazrat Isa, peace be on him, was a dear and chosen Messenger of God and that he loved him sincerely. It was, therefore, not possible that he should have applied any derogatory terms to the Messiah.

Let us now examine the background which the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has employed certain harsh expressions concerning Jesus. In this connection it should be clearly understood that according to the Promised Messiah, peace be on

him, the Isa of the Holy Quran and the Jesus of the Gospels are two different and distinct personalities. The Isa, son of Mary, peace be on him, mentioned in the Holy Quran was a Prophet of God and was loved by Him and was a chosen one, but the Jesus of the Gospels was a fictitious personality and from the accounts contained in the Gospels his life was stained and unmoral. The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has explained this in the following terms:

I desire to make it clear to the readers that my faith in Hazrat Masih, peace be on him, is a very good faith. I believe sincerely that he was a true prophet of God and was loved by Him and I believe that, as indicated by the Holy Quran, he had, as a means of his salvation, perfect faith in our lord and master, Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. He was one of the sincere servants of the law of Moses. I respect him according to his station. But the Jesus who is presented by the Christians, who claimed to be God and condemned everyone else except himself, both those who had gone before and who were to come after, as accursed, as having been guilty of vices the recompense of which is a curse, is regarded by us as deprived of Divine mercy. The Holy Quran makes no reference to this impertinent and foul-mouthed Jesus. We are surprised at the conduct of one who considered that God was subject to death and himself claimed to be God and who reviled such righteous ones as were thousand times better than him. In our writings we have had this fictitious Jesus of the Christians in mind. The humble servant of God, Isa, son of Mary, who was a Prophet and is mentioned in the Holy Quran, is not the object of our harsh condemnations. We have had to adopt this method after having endured for forty years the abuse of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessing of Allah be

upon him, by the Christian missionaries. (*Nurul Quran*, No. 2)

Again he has said:

It should be remembered that I hold this view concerning the Jesus who claimed to be God and held previous prophets to be thieves and robbers and has said nothing about the *Khatamul Anbya*, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, except that he, Jesus, would be followed by false prophets. Such a Jesus is nowhere mentioned in the Holy Quran. (*Anjam Aatham*, p. 13)

At another place he states:

I have uttered no word of disrespect concerning the Messiah, it is all a calumny of my opponents. It is true, however, that as there has not in fact been a Messiah who claimed to be God and who held the *Khatamul Anbya*, who was to come, as an impostor and who called Moses a robber, I have as a matter of argument certainly stated concerning such a Jesus that he who might have expressed himself in this manner could not be held to be righteous. But I believe in the Messiah, son of Mary, who describes himself as a servant of God and Messenger and affirms the truth of the *Khatamul Anbya*. (*Taryaql Qulub*, p. 77)

These statements make it clear that wherever the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has employed any harsh expression concerning Jesus, it has reference to the fictitious Jesus of the Gospels and not to Isa, son of Mary, peace be on him, who is mentioned in the Holy Qpran and whose like and reflection he himself was.

It might be asked why did the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, write against the fictitious Jesus of the Gospels and employed harsh expressions with regard to him? The reason was that at the time of the advent of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, and during a short period before his advent Christian missionaries had been in the habit of uttering vile abuse and making false charges against the blessed person of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, such as a sincere Muslim dare not even repeat. The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, as has been mentioned, had endured this torment for forty years. It was an unsupportable torture for him that anyone should be impertinent towards his lord and master, Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. His utter devotion to the Holy Prophet compelled him to adopt this method in defense of his master, in this manner, and thus to put an end to the vile attacks of the enemies. Such a refutation is a recognized method of defense to which recourse was held by previous divines and eminent personages in the faith, many instances of which are to be found in the history of Islam.

The Promised Messiah has explained:

I declare it with regret that we have had to issue this number of the *Nurul Quran* in answer to a person who, instead of adopting a civil method, has had recourse to vile abuse of our lord and master the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and out of his vileness he has uttered such calumnies against that Leader of the pure and Chief of the righteous, that the heart of a pious one trembles at hearing them. This reply is a refutation of the utterers of such abuse. We wish to declare that our belief concerning the Messiah, peace be upon him, is a very good belief and that we have sincere faith in that he

Was a true Prophet of God and was loved by Him. (*Nurul Quran*, No. 2)

He also states:

Padre Fateh Masih of Fateh Garh, District Gurdaspur, has addressed a vile letter to me in which he has charged our lord and master Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, with adultery and has, besides this, uttered vile abuse of him. I have, therefore, considered it necessary to reply to it and hence this booklet. I trust the Christian padres will study it carefully and will not be aggrieved at its language as the tone that has been adopted in it is in consequence of the harsh language and vile abuse employed by Mian Fateh Masih, Yet, it is necessary to uphold the holy station of the true Messiah, peace be on him. In reply to the harsh language of Fateh Masih, a fictitious Jesus has been portrayed and that also under great compulsion for this foolish one has abused the Holy Prophet peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, in a vile manner and has wounded our hearts. (*Nurul Quran*, No. 2)

He further states:

We wish to record that we had no concern with the Jesus of the Christian missionaries and his conduct. Their purposeless abuse of our Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, has provoked us that we should set forth somewhat of the circumstances of their Jesus. This vile and wicked Fateh Masih has in his letter that he has addressed to me called the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, an adulterer and has heaped other vile abuse on him. In the same way this dead and wicked sect that worships the dead has

compelled us that we should set forth somewhat of the circumstances of their Jesus. The Muslims should remember that God Almighty has made no mention of Jesus in the Holy Quran as to who he was, but the Christian missionaries believe that Jesus was a person who claimed to be God and called Moses a thief and a robber and denied the coming of the Holy Prophet and said that he himself would be followed by prophets who will all be false. We cannot accept such a vile thinker and arrogant man and an enemy of the righteous as a good human being let alone that we should accept him as a prophet. These foolish missionaries would be well advised to abandon this method of abuse lest God's jealousy be aroused. (*Zameemah Anjam Aatham*, p. 8)

The extracts cited above establish that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, under extreme provocation and out of his devoted love for the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, was roused to silence the Christian missionaries with this refutation. To him alone is due the credit that he adopted a firm stand against falsehood and frustrated the mischievous plans and impostures of the Christian missionaries against the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, for which the Muslims should be grateful to him rather than stand up in opposition to him. After all, if he pulled down into the dust the fictitious Jesus of the Christian missionaries, was it because they had any personal enmity towards him? Indeed not. He had recourse to this method as the safeguarding of the honor and reputation of his lord and master was dear to him and for this purpose he was ready to make any sacrifice. He had declared in a Persian verse:

I am ready to lay down my life in the cause of the faith of Mustafa; this is my sincere purpose which I hope to

achieve. Every fibers and muscle of my being is charged with his love. I am empty of my own self and am filled with anxiety on behalf of that beloved.

He states:

So many books full of vile abuse and defamation of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, have been printed and published the perusal of which makes one's body tremble. Our heart is so much in tribulation that if these people were to slaughter our children before our eyes and were to cut to pieces our sincere and beloved friends and were to kill us with great humiliation and were to take possession of our belongings, we call God to witness that even in such case we would not suffer so much grief and our heart would not be so severely wounded as we have suffered and endured under this abuse and defamation which has been directed against the Holy Prophet, peace and blessing of Allah be upon him. (*Ayena Kamalat-e-Islam*, p. 51)

In short, the Promised Messiah, peace he on him, has not in the slightest degree defamed Hazrat Isa, peace be on him, who as a dear Prophet and Elect of God Almighty. He has only, by way of refutation, condemned the Christians on the basis of the Gospels. In doing this, his only purpose was that the Christian missionaries should refrain from abusing and defaming and uttering false charges against the Leader of the righteous, Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. It is a fact that his adoption of this method of refutation silenced the Christian missionaries forever and the missionaries who, till the adoption of this method of defense by the Promised Messiah, peace he on him, did not refrain from leveling utterly baseless charges at the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, thereafter confined themselves to their own defense

and the stream of poison that had been issuing from their pens against the Holy Prophet was blocked, and the purpose of the Promised Messiah was achieved.

Another aspect of this question is: *How far were the charges made by the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, against the Jesus of the Gospels in fact justified?* For he would have been held guilty of abuse only if he had invented those charges himself. But if it is established that he merely repeated with reference to the Jesus of the Gospels that which is set out in the Gospels concerning him and which is admitted by the Christians, he cannot be blamed in any respect.

If we examine his writings for this purpose, we discover that there are three allegations which he made against the Jesus of the Gospels, namely:

1. He pointed out that the Jesus of the Gospels indulged in liquor;
2. That some of his grandmothers were guilty of adultery; and
3. That his mother was charged with adultery by his enemies.

With regard to the first charge the Promised Messiah states:

The damage that liquor has done to the people of the West is due to the fact that Jesus indulged in liquor, possibly on account of some disease or on account of habit. (*Kishti Nuh*, p. 65)

In this connection it is worthy of note that the very first miracle of Jesus that is mentioned in the Gospels is that on the occasion of a wedding he converted water into wine and thus the drinking of wine is a part of the Christian faith. Therefore, it cannot be

said that the Promised Messiah charged Jesus falsely. He attributed the drinking of wine to him according to the statements of the Gospels.

Secondly, during his time the drinking of liquor had not been forbidden. That is why among the Christians the drinking of wine on the occasion of the Last Supper is a religious ceremony which they imagine was initiated by Jesus.

Thus whatever way we look at it, the Promised Messiah did not make any false charge against Jesus in this respect. On the contrary, he stated, by way of extenuation that Jesus might have taken wine on account of some chronic disease.

The second objection is that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has written that some of the grandmothers of Jesus were guilty of adultery.

The Christians have charged members of the holy family of the Holy Prophet with all sorts of faults. They contend that as the Holy Prophet was descended from Hagar, who according to the Christians was a slave of Abraham, peace be on him, and according to them the descendants of a female slave have no right of spiritual succession, therefore, the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, cannot be accepted as a Prophet. Christian writers have advanced several false charges against the Holy Prophet himself and the members of his family. In reply to all this, the Promised Messiah showed from the Bible that as a bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to his tenth generation (Deut. 23:2)

The Jesus of the Gospels could not enter into the congregation of the Lord inasmuch as in his genealogy three women are mentioned who were guilty of adultery. These women were

Tamar, Rachab and the wife of Uriah. Padre Imaduddin, in his commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, has observed:

This shows that Lord Jews did not disdain to be born in the chain of sinners.

Thus the Promised Messiah refuted from Christian sources the calumny that the ancestors of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, were not sinless people. There is no such allegation concerning him in any standard Islamic book or history, while the Bible contains statements to the effect that we have mentioned which are admitted by Christian scholars. Whatever the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, wrote about the Jesus of the Gospels was not from himself but was drawn from Christian sources which he cited. No objection can, therefore, be taken to whatever he wrote in this context.

The calumny against the mother of Jesus is well known. It is the Holy Quran that cleared her of it.

Finality of Prophethood

The principal charge leveled against the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, is that (God save us), he repudiated the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, being the *Khataman Nabiyyeen*.

This is an utterly false charge. The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has repeatedly affirmed in his writings that he believes that every word and vowel point of the Holy Quran is from God and that this is part of his faith. He was the first person in Islam who proclaimed that not one word of the Holy Quran is abrogated. He challenged those who believe that a certain number of verses of the Holy Quran have been abrogated, to come forth in opposition to his declaration and that he would establish that not a single word of the Holy Quran has been abrogated. To say concerning such a person that (God save us) he repudiated a whole verse of the Holy Quran (33:41) is a monstrosity.

He has stated:

I call Allah, the Glorious, to witness that I am not a disbeliever. My doctrine is that there is no one worthy of worship save Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah . I believe concerning him that he was the Messenger of Allah and the *Khataman Nabiyyeen*. I affirm the truth of this statement with as many oaths as are the Holy names of Allah and as are the letters of the Holy Quran and as is the number of the excellencies of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. No belief of mine is contrary to the commands of Allah and His Messenger. He who imagines anything contrary

to this labors under a mis-conception. (*Karamatus Sadiqeen*, p. 25)

Again he has stated:

The person who was above all, and was a perfect man, and a perfect prophet, and who came with the fullness of blessings, through whom, on account of his spiritual advent and the spiritual resurrection that he brought about, the first judgment manifested itself and a whole universe that was dead was revived, that blessed prophet *Khatamul Anbiya*, Leader of the elect, *Katamul Mursileen*, Pride of the Prophets was Muhammad Mustafa, peace and the blessings of Allah be upon him. (*Itmamul Hujjah*, p. 28)

He claimed:

Allah is Glorious, Allah is Glorious; what a high station was that of the *Khatamul Anbiya*, the peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. Glory be to Allah, what high degree of light was his. (*Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya*, p. 246)

My belief that I hold in this life and with which, by the grace of Allah, I shall pass on from this world is that our lord and master, Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, was *Khataman Nabiyyeen* and the best of Messengers. (*Izala Auham*, Part I, p. 137)

He declared:

I believe in the *Khatam-i-Nabuwat* of the *Khatamul Anbiya*, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and consider one who denies the *Khatam-i-Nabuwat* as faithless and outside the pale of Islam. (*Taqreer Wajabul Ilan*, 1891)

He has stated:

My belief is that our Holy Prophet is better and more exalted than all the Messengers and is *Khataman Nabiyyeen*.
(*Ayenah Kamalat Islam*, p. 327)

He has declared:

I believe that our Holy Prophet, Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, is more exalted than all the Messengers and is the *Khatamul Anbiya*. (*Hamamatul Bushra*, p. 8)

He has affirmed:

I believe truly and perfectly in the verse which says: 'But he was the Messenger of Allah and *Khataman Nabiyyeen*.'
(*Ek Ghati Ka Izala*)

All this makes it clear beyond doubt that the Promised Messiah, peace be upon him, had perfect faith in the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, being the *Khataman Nabiyyeen*, and that he considered anyone who repudiated this as being outside the pale of Islam. It is, therefore, the height of injustice to allege that he denied the *Khatam-i-Nabuwat* of Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him.

It is true, however, that the Ahmadiyya Community differs with some of the Muslim divines in the true meaning and interpretation of the relevant verse (33:41). The Ahmadis have firm faith in the verse itself and a difference of view regarding its meaning and interpretation does not import disbelief. In the history of Islam great Imams and divines have differed with each other in the matter of interpretation on several questions. Despite those differences they were all considered Muslims and

are worthy of honor by all Muslims. Such Imams and high authorities have interpreted this particular verse (33:41) exactly as the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement has interpreted it. Will they all, God forbid, be held to be non-Muslims? It would be obviously unjust that if X interprets a verse in one way he should be held to be a Muslim but if Y interprets it in the same way, he should be held to be a disbeliever. We set out, by way of illustration, the interpretations of this verse (33:41) by some of the outstanding divines.

Hazrat Mulla Ali Qari (mercy of Allah be upon him), who died in 1014 A.H. and was a great research scholar and a master of Hanafi jurisprudence and was a great Imam, has stated in his book *Mauzuat Kabir*, with reference to the saying of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him:

Had Ibrahim (the Holy Prophet's infant son) survived, he would have been a true prophet, that if Ibrahim had survived and had become a prophet he would still have been a follower of the Holy Prophet; and he has interpreted the verse (33:41) as meaning that there would be no prophet after the Holy Prophet who would abrogate his law and who would not be one of his followers.

In the same way, Hazrat Shah Waliullah, Muhaddas of Delhi (mercy of Allah be upon him), who has been acclaimed as the Reformer of the 12th century of Islam, has stated in his book *Tafheemat Ilahiyyah*:

The prophets came to an end with the Holy Prophet, meaning that there can be no divinely inspired reformer after him who would be commissioned by Allah, the Glorious, with a new law.

Thus there can be a difference in the interpretation of the verse, but so far as faith in the verse is concerned it is not open to any doubt that the Promised Messiah, peace be upon him, had full faith in it.

The verse is as follows:

Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the Messenger of Allah and the Seal of the Prophets. Allah has full knowledge of all things. (33:41)

Our opponents say that the expression *Khataman Nabiyyeen*, which has been employed in this verse, relating to the Holy Prophet, means that by his advent prophethood has been closed and that he was the last prophet in every sense. This interpretation is not correct. The word *Khatam* means seal and thus the expression *Khataman Nabiyyeen* means the Seal of the Prophets. The verse states that Muhammad is not the father of any man but is the Messenger of Allah and is the Seal of the Prophets. The question, therefore, is what is the true meaning of the expression 'Seal of the Prophets' in this context? Our opponents contend that the phrase *Khataman Nabiyyeen* does mean the Seal of the Prophets but that its interpretation is that the Holy Prophet was the last prophet, for the purpose of a seal is to close a document.

It is well known, however, that the purpose of a seal is not to close a statement but to certify it as correct. That is why often a seal is affixed to a document at its top and in other cases it is affixed at its bottom or at its end. Its purpose is to certify the genuineness and correctness of the contents of the document. It is well known that after the truce of Hudaibiyyah, when the Holy Prophet decided to address letters to the rulers and chiefs of surrounding territories inviting them to the acceptance of Islam, he was told that rulers and chiefs do not attach any significance to a communication addressed to them unless it bears the seal of

the writer. Thereupon the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had a seal prepared which was thereafter used for the attestation and certification of documents (Bukhari and Muslim).

The purpose of a seal being attestation and certification, the interpretation of the verse in question would be that though the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had no male issue, yet being the Messenger of Allah he is the spiritual progenitor of his followers. He is, therefore, not without issue but has a large progeny. It is added that he is not merely a Divine Messenger but is also the Seal of the Prophets, that is to say, he is not only the progenitor of the generality of the believers but is the spiritual progenitor of the prophets and messengers also and thus he occupies the exalted position which imports that no prophet or messenger can now appear unless he bears with him the confirmatory seal of the Holy Prophet. This means that the Holy Prophet is not only the spiritual progenitor of the generality of believers but is also the spiritual progenitor of prophets and messengers.

If this verse is construed as meaning that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, was absolutely the last prophet, the verse becomes meaningless. In that case its meaning would be: 'Muhammad had no son but he is the last prophet.' In Arabic idiom the word 'but' which has been used here is employed for the purpose of introducing an explanation in modification of what has gone before, or for the purpose of clearing a doubt which the previous statement might raise. The use of the word 'but' in this verse entails that it should be followed by a statement which modifies or clarifies that which has gone before. In view of this the interpretation put forward by our opponents makes the verse meaningless, for it would then amount to a statement that though the Holy Prophet has no

issue, no prophet will come after him. This would constitute no praise of the Holy Prophet.

The interpretation of the verse adopted by the Ahmadiyya Community is in exact accord with that attributed to it by great Imams and the elect in the past. For instance, Hazrat Ayesha (may Allah be pleased with her) is reported as having said:

Say he was *Khataman Nabiyyeen*, but do not say that there will be no prophet after him. (*Durre Manshur*, Vol. V of *Jalaludin Suyuti*)

Hazrat Mohyuddin ibn Arabi has stated in his book, *Futuhut Makkiyyah*:

Prophethood will continue among men till the Judgment Day, though a new law is barred. Law is a part of prophethood.

Hazrat Imam Muhammad Tahir has stated in his book, *Majmaul Bihar*:

The saying of Hazrat Ayesha that Muslims should call the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, *Khataman Nabiyyeen*, but should not say that there would be no prophet after him, had reference to the advent of the Promised Messiah. The direction given by Hazrat Ayesha is not in contradiction with the *hadees*: 'There will be no prophet after me'; for the meaning of the Holy Prophet was that there would be no prophet after him who would abrogate his law.

Hazrat Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi (may Allah have mercy on him) Reformer of the second millennium, who is held in great honor, has stated:

The achievement by the followers of the Holy Prophet by way of obedience and inheritance of the excellencies of prophethood after the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, is not inconsistent with his being the *Khatamar Rusul* (*Maktubat Ahmadiyya*, Vol. I)

Hazrat Shah Waliullah, Muhaddas of Delhi, may Allah have mercy on him, who was a great divine and was the Reformer of the 12th century of Islam, has stated in his book *Tafheemat Ilahiyyah* that the meaning of prophethood having come to an end with the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, is that there will be no one who will be appointed by God Almighty with a new law.

These are only a few out of hundreds of statements made by eminent Muslim divines and righteous people who have interpreted the expression *Khataman Nabiyyeen* in the same way as the Promised Messiah, peace be upon him, has interpreted it. If despite differences in interpretation they were Muslims and were accepted as believers in the Holy Quran, why should the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, be penalized for having the same belief? Such an attitude would be the height of injustice.

There is a serious contradiction involved in the stand taken by the divines who are opposed to the Ahmadiyya Movement. On the one hand they pronounce the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, a disbeliever because in their estimation his claim of prophethood is contradictory of the verse which pronounces the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, as being *Khataman Nabjyyeen*; and on the other hand they believe that Jesus, son of Mary, who is a Prophet, would come a second time. If the Seal of Prophethood is disrupted by the claim of the Promised Messiah that he is a prophet by reflection, then how is it that it would not be disrupted by the second advent of Jesus who was a Prophet in his own right? The bulk of the Muslims

believe that Jesus would descend from heaven in his earthly body and would be a prophet.

For instance, Maulana Maudoodi Sahib has stated:

The second advent of Jesus is a question on which the Muslims are all agreed. This belief is based upon the Holy Quran, *hadees*, and consensus ... This is a certainty and admits of no doubt that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, has announced the second advent of Jesus. This is established by irrefutable testimony. If such testimony can be rejected, no historical event of the world can be accepted. (*Answer to ten questions on behalf of Jamaat Islami*, p. 24)

In a *hadees* of Muslim, the Messiah who was to come has been described as the Prophet of Allah. The stand of the Ahl-i-Hadees sect in this matter is that there is a consensus among the Muslims and it is supported by the *ahadees* that the Promised Messiah would be a prophet. (*Ahl-i-Hadees*, 29 November 1966).

Imam Sayuti, Ibn Arabi, and Ibn Hajar have all clearly affirmed that in his second advent, the Messiah would be a prophet. Basing himself on a statement by Imam Sayuti, Nawab Siddique Hasan Khan Sahib wrote:

He who asserts that Hazrat Isa, when he comes down will not be a prophet and would be deprived of his prophethood is certainly a disbeliever as Imam Jalaludin Sayuti has clearly affirmed, inasmuch as Hazrat Isa is a Prophet and a prophet is not deprived of his quality of prophethood either in his lifetime or after his death. (*Hujajul Karamah*, p. 431)

Shaikh Ibn Arabi has said:

There is no difference of opinion on the question that Hazrat Isa is a Prophet and a Messenger and it is agreed that he would appear in the latter days and his prophethood is well established (*Futuhat Makkiyyah*, Vol. II, p. 3)

Shaikh Ibn Hajar wrote:

Hazrat Isa is an honored Prophet. After he comes down he would still be a Prophet and Messenger. An affirmation by a person of no account that he will be only a member of the Muslim community is not correct, inasmuch as he being one of the Muslims and his giving effect to the Islamic law is not inconsistent with his being a Prophet and a Messenger. (*Alfatawa Alhadisiyyah*, p. 129)

Thus, it is the united stand of the Muslims that at the time of his second advent the Messiah will still be clothed with the robe of prophethood and that this would not be inconsistent with the verse which describes the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, as *Khataman Nabiyyeen* (33:41).

How unjust, therefore, it is that despite the belief that Jesus of Nazareth will descend from heaven in his capacity of the Messiah of Israel and that he will be a Prophet and that this would not disrupt the Seal of Prophethood, Hazrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, who claimed to be a follower of the Holy Prophet and a Prophet by way of reflection and declared his purpose to be perfect obedience to the Holy Prophet, should be held to have been outside the pale of Islam on account of this claim.

Here are some instances of the use of the expression *Khatam* in the connotation of high, eminent, excellent etc. but not meaning the last:

1. *Abu Tayyub was pronounced Khatamus Shuara. (Introduction to the Divan of Mutanabbi p. 5)*
2. *Hazrat Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, was Khatamul Aulia. (Tafseer Safi, Surah Ahzab)*
3. *Hazrat Imam Shafai was Khatamul Aulia. (At Tuhfatus Sunnia, p. 45)*
4. *Shaikh Ibn Arabi was Khatamul Aulia. (Title page of Fatuhat Makkiyyah)*
5. *Shah Abdul Aziz was Khatamul Muhaddaseen Wal Mufasssireen. (Hadyatis Shia, p. 7)*
6. *Maulvi Anwar Shah Sahib Kashmiri was Khatamul Muhaddaseen. (Raisul Ahrar, p. 99)*
7. *Habib Shirazi is considered Khatumushuara in Iran. (Hayate Saadi, p. 87)*
8. *Imam Suyuti was Khatamul Muhaddaseen. (Hadyatis Shia, p. 210)*
9. *Hazrat Ali was Khatamul Auwsia. (Minar-ul Huda, p. 106)*
10. *Maulvi Muhammad Qasim was Khatamul Muffasireen. (Asrar-e-Qurani, title page)*

Claim of the Promised Messiah

One notion that is put forward is that by claiming to be a prophet, the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, put himself outside the pale of Islam inasmuch as his claim was inconsistent with the verse of the Holy Quran which describes the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, as *Khataman Naibiyyeen*. (33:41)

It should be clearly grasped that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement has certainly not claimed to be a prophet in accordance with the concept of prophethood which is entertained by some of the Muslim divines and is commonly current among Muslims. It is considered that a prophet is one who brings a new law or is not the Follower of a previous prophet, but is a prophet in his own right.

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has clearly and emphatically denied being such a prophet. For instance, he has said:

All prophethoods, except the Mohammedi prophethood, are now closed. No prophet can arise even without a law but only one who is a follower of the Holy Prophet.
(*Tajalliat Ilahiyah*, p. 25)

He has repeatedly announced that he is not a law-bearing prophet and that he is a follower of the Holy Quran. He has disclaimed being a prophet in his own right and his claim is confined to being the Mahdi and the Messiah. He affirms his being a servant of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and his follower and that all grace bestowed upon him is on account of his devotion to the Holy Prophet and that he

has been raised in accordance with the prophecies and promises of the Holy Prophet. For instance, he has said:

It is not permissible to apply the title prophet to anyone after the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, unless such a person is also described as a follower of the Holy Prophet, which means that he has been bestowed all bounties on account of his devotion to the Holy Prophet and not directly on his own. (*Tajalliat Ilahiyyah*, p. 9)

Again, he has said:

I cannot acquire any degree of honor or excellence, nor any station of exaltation or nearness to God except through sincere and perfect obedience to the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, Whatever is bestowed upon me is by way of reflection of, and through, the Holy Prophet. (*Izlah Auham*, p. 138)

He has declared:

All windows opening on to prophethood have been closed except the window accessible to a *siddique*, that is to say, the window of complete and perfect devotion to the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him. (*Ek Ghalati Ka Izalah*, p. 3)

Again, he has declared:

By the pure grace of God and not by any merit of my own, I have been bestowed a perfect portion of the bounty which was bestowed before me on the Prophets and Messengers and the elect of God. It would not have been possible for me to be bestowed this bounty unless I had

followed my lord and master, the pride of the prophets, the best of mankind, Hazrat Mohammed Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. Whatever I have been bestowed has been bestowed upon me on account of this obedience. I know through my true and perfect knowledge that no human being can approach God or acquire perfect understanding of the Divine except through following the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. (*Haqeeqatul Wahi*, p. 62)

Again, he has declared:

God, Who was aware of the *secret* of the heart of the Holy Prophet, exalted him above all the Prophets and all mankind who were before him or might come after him and granted him all his objectives in his lifetime. He is the fountainhead of all grace and anyone who claims any excellence without confessing his obligation to him is not a human being but is progeny of Satan, for the key of every excellence has been bestowed upon him and the treasure of all understanding has been granted to him. He who does not achieve through him is deprived forever. What am I and what is my reality? I would be ungrateful if I were not to confess that I have discovered the true Unity of God only through the Holy Prophet, and have been bestowed the understanding of God only through this perfect Prophet and through his light. (*Haqeeqatul Wahi*, p. 115)

It is thus clear beyond doubt that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, did not consider himself a prophet in his own right, but believed that God Almighty had bestowed upon him the title of prophet for the purpose of establishing the perfect law brought by the Holy Prophet, in his capacity as his follower and servant and that he was not given any new law.

Only a day before his death he made the following public declaration:

The charge leveled against me that I claim to be a prophet who has no connection with Islam and that I consider myself a prophet in my own right, who has no need of following the Holy Quran, and that I have proclaimed my own credo, and have established a new qibla, and declare the Islamic law as abrogated, and go outside the following of and obedience to the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, is wholly false. I consider such a claim of prophethood as amounting to disbelief. Not only today but in every one of my books I have affirmed that I lay no claim to any such prophethood and that this is a false allegation against me. The only reason that I call myself a prophet is that I am honored with the converse of God Almighty and that He speaks to me frequently and responds to me and discloses much of the unseen to me and communicates to me the mysteries of the future such that are not disclosed to anyone unless he enjoys special nearness to God. It is on account of the multiplicity of these experiences that I have been made a prophet. (*Akhbare Aam*, 26 May 1908)

He has stated:

Had I not been a follower of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and had not obeyed him, then even if my good deeds had reached the tops of mountains, I would not have been honored with the converse of God inasmuch as all prophethoods except the Muhammadi prophethood have come to an end. (*Tajalliat Ilahiyah*, p. 24)

The type of prophethood claimed by the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, is mentioned in the *ahadees* and in the writings of righteous Muslim divines of the past. The Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, has described the Promised Reformer who would appear among the Muslims as Allah's prophet and has repeated this four times (Muslim). According to the bulk of Muslims today, Jesus, who, according to them is alive in heaven with his earthly body, will come back again for the reform of Muslims. Assuming for a moment that this concept is justified, the question arises whether during his second advent he would be a prophet or not, for it is an accepted doctrine that a prophet is never deprived of his prophethood. If by his advent the Seal of Prophethood of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, would not be broken, then how is it broken by the claim of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, that he is a prophet by way of reflection of the Holy Prophet? Indeed, the advent of Jesus who was a prophet in Israel for the purpose of the reform of the Muslims is a humiliation for the Muslims and is contrary to the purport of the verse that describes the Holy Prophet as *Khataman Nabiyeen* (33:41). In this context, the Promised Messiah has observed:

If it is asked that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, being *Khataman Nabiyeen*, how can any other prophet arise after him, the answer is that without a doubt no new or old prophet can come after the Holy Prophet as you believe that Jesus, being a prophet, would come in the latter days. Your doctrine is that for forty years Jesus would continue to be a prophet and a recipient of divine revelation, a period that by far exceeds the period of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet. Such a doctrine is, no doubt, sinful and its falsity is borne witness to by the verse: 'But he is the Messenger of Allah and *Khataman Nabiyeen*' (33:41); and by the *hadees*:

‘There will be no prophet after me.’ I am utterly opposed to all such doctrines and I have firm belief in the verse: ‘But he is the Messenger of Allah and *Khataman Nabiyeen*’ (33:41). This verse contains a prophecy of which our opponents are not aware, and that prophecy is that after the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, all doors of prophecy have been closed and that it is not possible now that a Hindu, or a Jew, or a Christian, or a merely formal Muslim, should be able to establish the applicability of the word prophet to himself. All windows of prophethood are now closed except the window of complete obedience to the Holy Prophet. Therefore, he who approaches God through this window is reflectively clothed with the same cloak of prophethood which is the cloak of the Muhammadi prophethood. The prophethood of such a one is not apart and distinct from the prophethood of the Holy Prophet, inasmuch as he does not claim it in his own right but receives everything from the fountain of the Holy Prophet, not for himself but for his glory. For this reason he is named Mohammed and Ahmad in heaven. This means that the prophethood of Mohammed is bestowed upon Mohammed by way of reflection and not upon anyone else. This verse, therefore, means that Mohammed is not the father of any man from amongst the men of the world but is the father of the men of the hereafter because he is the *Khataman Nabiyeen* and there is no way of access to Divine grace except through him.

Thus my prophethood and messengership derives from my being Mohammed and Ahmad and not on account of my own self. These names have been bestowed upon me on account of my utter devotion to the Holy Prophet. Therefore, the concept of *Khataman Nabiyeen* has not been

contravened by my advent, but it would certainly be contravened by the advent of Jesus a second time. (*Ek Ghalati Ka Izalah*)

He has also stated:

Many people are misled by the use of the word prophet in my claim and imagine as if I have claimed a prophethood which was bestowed upon the prophets in earlier times, but they are mistaken in so thinking. I have made no such claim. The Divine wisdom has bestowed this grace upon me that I have raised to the station of prophethood through the blessings of the grace of the Holy Prophet, so that the perfection of the spiritual grace of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, might be established. Therefore, I cannot be designated only as prophet but as a prophet and a follower of the Holy Prophet at one and the same time. My prophethood is a reflection of the prophethood of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and is not a prophethood in its own right. That is why, both in the *hadees* and in my revelation, as I have been called a prophet, I have also been called a follower of the Holy Prophet so that it should be clear that every excellence that has been bestowed upon me has been bestowed through my following the Holy Prophet and through my obedience to him. (*Haqeeqatul Wahi*, p. 150)

Then he has said:

God is One and Mohammed, on whom be the peace and blessings of Allah, is His Prophet and he is the *Khatamul Anbya* and above all other prophets. After him there is no other prophet except one who is clothed in the cloak of Mohammed by way of reflection, for a servant has no

identity apart from his master, nor is a branch distinct from its trunk. He who is bestowed the title of prophet on account of his complete absorption in his master does not contravene the *Khatam-i-Nabuwat*. When you observe your reflection in a mirror there are not two of you but only one, though there appear two; only one is the original and the other is his reflection. This is what God desired in the case of the Promised Messiah. (*Kishti Nuh*, p. 15)

All these writings make it clear that according to the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, after the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, it is only the door of reflective prophethood which is open to a true and devoted follower of the Holy Prophet. Being a reflection of the Holy Prophet, he deemed himself as included in the identity of the Holy Prophet and claimed no separate and distinct position for himself. It must be remembered that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, did not in any way claim to be law-bearing prophet or has claimed to be a prophet in his own right. He has categorically stated:

Keep well in mind that the door of law-bearing prophethood is firmly closed after the Holy Prophet and that there is no book after the Holy Quran which can bring new commandments or can abrogate any commandment of the Holy Quran or can suspend obedience to it. The Holy Quran is binding till the Day of judgment. (*Al-Wasiyyat*, p. 12)

Again, he has said:

God is the enemy of him who regards the Holy Quran as abrogated and acts contrary to the law of Islam and seeks to bring into operation his own law. (*Chashmah Maarifat*, p. 324)

He has affirmed:

I am a prophet, but my prophethood is not law-bearing which would abrogate the Book of Allah and put into effect a new book. I consider such a claim as amounting to disbelief in Islam. (*Badr*, 5 March 1908)

He has declared:

I have repeatedly affirmed that the truth and reality is that our lord and master, the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, is the *Khatamul Anbya* and after him there is no prophethood in its own right nor any new law. Anyone who claims differently is, without a doubt, faithless and rejected. (*Chashmah Maarifat*, p. 324)

In view of all these declarations, no God-fearing, just person dare assert that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, claimed to be a law-bearing prophet or a prophet in his own right.

The Opponents of the Promised Messiah

One of the objections raised against the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement is that he reviled his opponents, he called them ***zurayatul bagbaya*** and other harsh names which is inconsistent with the dignity of a prophet.

This is an entirely false charge and has no substance. The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has not reviled anyone, but in certain cases he confronted some of his opponents with their true picture and that only when those opponents raised a storm of vituperation against him and reviled him and his followers in vicious language and issued declarations against him in terms of vile abuse. He then drew their attention to their vileness. To describe a blind person as sightless is not harsh or abusive. In the Holy Quran, the Jews and the Christians have been described as the vilest of creatures and have been called apes and swine and the worshippers of Satan (5:61). The Jews have been compared with a donkey carrying a load of books (62:6). A certain personality has been compared to a dog (7:177). It cannot be said that God Almighty has reviled these people or has used abusive language with reference to them. These expressions were employed against them in view of their moral and spiritual condition.

In the same way the Promised Messiah has not reviled anyone. For instance, at one place addressing the maulvis he described them as the vile sect of maulvis (*Anjam Aatham*, p. 21) whereupon a clamor was raised that he had abused them, whereas he had only applied to them an expression employed in a hadees in which it is reported that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had said that the divines of the latter days would be the vilest of creation under heaven (*Mishkat, Kitabul Ilm*). The Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him,

having called the divines of the latter days the vilest of creation, how could the Promised Mahdi and Messiah be blamed for addressing them in those terms?

Abuse is one thing and a correct description, however bitter and harsh, is quite another, It is the duty of every speaker of truth to convey the truth to an erring opponent even though he might thereby (*Izalah Auham*).

At another place he states:

My words had assumed some severity against my opponents in my writings, but I was not the one to start such severity. Those writings were undertaken in reply to the severe attacks of my opponents. They had used such harsh and abusive language as called for some severity. This can be perceived by the comparison which I have instituted between the harsh language used by my opponents -and that used by *me* in the foreword of my book which I have called *Kitabul Bariyyah*. As I have just stated the harsh language used by me was by way of retort. It was my opponents who first used such language against me, I could have endured their harsh language without making a retort to it but I had recourse to a retort on account of two reasons: One, so that my opponents, being faced with severity in reply to their harsh strictures, might change their tactics and might revert in future to the use of civil language; and two, that the general Muslim public should not be aroused by the defamatory and provocative language used by my opponents. (*Kitabul Bariyyah*, p. 10, 11)

So far as genuine divines and respectable people were concerned, the Promised Messiah has referred to them in his books in very good style. He states:

In this book and in my other books there is no harsh word or indication against those respectable people who do not descend to abuse and meanness. (*Ayyamus Sulh*, title page)

He states further:

We seek refuge with God against defaming righteous divines and civilized respectable people, whether they are Muslims or Christians or Aryas. We consider all of them worthy of honor. We are not concerned even with foolish people. Our severe language is employed only against those who have become notorious on account of their vile language and foul-mouthed utterances. We always mention in good terms those who are good and are not given to abuse and we honor them and love them like brothers. (*Lujjatun Nur*, p. 61)

By way of illustration of the type of language used against the Promised Messiah we set out one specimen out of hundreds. Maulvi Muhammad Hussain of Batala described him as a secret enemy of Islam, a second *Masailmah*, Anti-Christ, confirmed liar, black-faced. He said:

A rope should be drawn around his neck and he should be decked out with a garland of shoes round his neck and should in this condition be paraded in the cities of India. He is a satan, evil-doer, wicked, shameless, worse than Anti-Christ, a descendant of Hulaqui. (*Ishaatus Sunnah*)

Confronted with hundreds of such abusive and offensive declarations, if the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, set up a mirror before their authors by way of illustrating their low morals, how is he to be blamed? He made no false charge against them, nor did he abuse them but only applied to them in its true

import the prophecy that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had made concerning them.

Let us now examine the specific charges of defamation and abuse of the divines which have been urged against the Promised Messiah, peace be on him.

It is objected that he castigated the divines by applying to them the expression ***zurrayatul baghaya*** which, it is alleged, means “the progeny of prostitutes.” The sentence from which this term is taken occurs in “*Ayena Kamalat Islam*” and runs as follows:

Every Muslim will accept me and will confirm my claim except the *zurrayatul baghaya* whose hearts will have been sealed up by God Almighty.

This is a prophecy that a time will come when all Muslims will accept him and confirm his claim except such wicked ones whose hearts might be sealed by God Almighty. Thus it is clear that it is not the divines who are referred to in this sentence. Therefore, their clamor that they have been abused by the use of this expression is entirely without cause. The well known lexicon, *Tajul Urus*, has given the meaning of *baghy*, which is the singular of *baghaya*, as a female slave whether of ill conduct or not. Accordingly, the meaning of the expression *zurrayatul baghaya* would be the progeny of female slaves, that is to say, those who do not possess the manly quality of accepting the truth.

The *Tajul Urus* further states that to call a person ‘son of a *baghayyah*’ means that he is **deprived of guidance**.

The Promised Messiah himself has interpreted the term as meaning a wicked person. On Saadullah of Ludhiana being mentioned, the Promised Messiah observed that in his poem in *Anjam Aatham*, he had said concerning Saadullah:

You have persecuted me out of your vileness and now if you do not die in disgrace, O' wicked one, *ibn bagha*, I will not have been proved truthful in my claim.

Thus according to the Promised Messiah, the expression *zurayatul baghayah* meant the **progeny of the wicked and not the progeny of prostitutes** as is alleged by his opponents. The, Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has applied to his opposing divines the same expressions that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, applied to them as a prophecy.

He said:

There will arise a great turbulence among my people and in their terror they will have recourse to their divines and suddenly they will find them in the guise of **apes and swine**. (*Kanzul Ummal*, Vol. VII, p. 90)

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, desired peace with the divines and employed some harsh words against some of them under grave provocation. He addressed the following invitation to his opposing divines:

It has occurred to me again today that I should once more approach you for peace ... Both sides should make a firm promise that they and all those who are under their influence would refrain from the use of every type of harsh language, which would include the use of expressions like Anti-Christ, faithless, wicked for the other side. . . The honor of the other side should not be assailed expressly or implied-ly. If someone from one side should visit the other side he should be received with civility and courtesy ... I have arranged that no one from my Community will publish anything orally or in writing which might be defamatory or contemptuous of any of

you, This arrangement would go into effect when you announce that you will be responsible for seeing that all those who are under your influence, or are deemed to be under your influence, will refrain from the use of any type of abuse, defamation or vituperation. If such an agreement is put into effect it would be quite easy to determine in future which of the two sides has been guilty of aggression. (*Tabligh Risalat*, Vol. 1, p. 8)

The fact is that the Arabic expressions like *waladul baghaya*, *ibnal haram*, *ibnal halal*, and *bintal halal* etc. are all idiomatic expressions connoting evil-doers and do not mean illegitimate descent.

It should be kept in mind that the use of harsh language against the enemies of truth and to ridicule them and to make a harsh retort in answer to their harshness has been a characteristic of religious polemics through the ages. There is a *hadees* related on the authority of Hazrat Ayesha, may Allah be pleased with her, that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, directed his Companions to compose satires against the Quraish as a satire would be more painful for them than arrows shot against them. He sent for **Ibn Rawaha** and asked him to compose a satire against the Quraish, which he did, but the satire did not please the Holy Prophet. He then sent for **Kaab bin Malik** and then for **Hasaan bin Sabit**. The latter composed a long satire the first verse of which was:

You have satirized Muhammad and I proceed to answer you on his behalf looking to Allah for a reward. (*Muslim*, Part 2, chapter 'Fazail Hasaan bin Sabit')

In a comment upon this *hadees*, Imam Novi has written:

One should not be the first to embark upon severity or ridicule of the pagans, so that Muslims should safeguard their tongues

against undesirable language. But **when the other side embarks upon abuse and there should be need of defense against their mischief, it is permissible, as the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, directed.**

Another objection that is raised against the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, is that he had called some of his opponents **waladul haram**. This expression occurs in a statement of the Promised Messiah, peace be upon him, which is as follows:

He who indulges in nonsense against this clear decision and out of wickedness goes on repeating that the Christians have achieved victory and continues immodest and shameless and without replying justly to our decision will not refrain from denial and the use of loose language and will not admit our victory will make it clear that he is eager to be considered a bastard and is not legitimate.
(*Anwarul Islam*, p. 30)

It should be remembered that a study of the Holy Quran reveals that by the progeny of the prophets is meant their spiritual progeny. A person who does not believe in the prophets and is un-righteous in his conduct can be told metaphorically that his conduct is not of those legitimately born, meaning, that if he had loved the prophets he would have acted like them and would have been called their spiritual descendant. This is illustrated by the son of Noah whom the Holy Quran did not accept as such. When he was about to be drowned Noah supplicated on his behalf and pleaded:

‘Lord, my son is a part of my family.’ God responded: ‘He is surely not of thy family, Noah, for he is one of un-righteous conduct.’ (11:46-47) Thus, though he was physically the son of Noah, God Almighty did not accept him as such on account of his wickedness. In the same way, it is said in the Holy Quran that the

wives of the Holy Prophet are the mothers of the believers (33:7) and this also means that they are their mothers in a spiritual sense. Their being the mothers of the believers entails that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, is the father of the believers, though physically they are not his progeny. The Holy Quran thus establishes that by the progeny of the Holy Prophet is meant his spiritual progeny, and if a person calling himself a Muslim is pleased when Islam is insulted and supports the enemies of Allah and His Messenger, he would cease to be the progeny of the Holy Prophet.

The passage of the *Nurul Islam* relied upon by the opponents of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, clearly relates to a person who, calling himself a Muslim, declared Christianity as being victorious against Islam and persisted in this assertion. Such a one cut himself asunder from being the progeny of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and proved that he was metaphorically a bastard as he had repudiated his spiritual father, the Holy Prophet, and had attributed himself to someone else.

The Promised Messiah explained further:

Some people calling themselves Muslims, who should be called semi-Christians, were so pleased that Abdullah Aatham had not died within fifteen months that they could not restrain their joy. They made announcements in which, according to their habit, they expressed themselves in intemperate language and on account of their personal rancor against me they even attacked Islam inasmuch as my controversy with the Christians was in support of Islam and did not involve the question of my being the Promised Messiah. They might have considered me a disbeliever, or satan, or Anti-Christ, but the discussion related to the truth of the Holy Prophet, peace

and blessings of Allah be upon him, and the superiority of the Holy Quran. A truthful one is he who believes sincerely in the *Khatamul Anbiya*, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and accepts the Holy Quran as the Word of God. He who considers that Jesus was God and rejects the prophethood of the *KhatamulAnbiya*, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, is a liar. I had cited a revelation of mine in support of this, but I have to affirm in sorrow that in order to prove me false the opposing divines did not keep in mind the honor of Allah and His Messenger and did not in the least mind the conclusion which the enemy would draw from defeat of the Islamic side. Mian Sanaullah, Saadullah, Abdul Haq, and others, having conceded the victory of the Christians, why do they complain about the Christians that they use their alleged victory as an argument against Islam, when the whole controversy was about the truth or falsehood of Islam and Christianity and not about any particular doctrine of mine. (*Anwarul Islam* p. 48)

This shows that the expression to which exception is taken was applied by the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, to those who were in effect semi-Christians, who declared the victory of the Christians and thus attacked Islam, who joined the Christians in celebrating their alleged victory, who cursed the righteous and had no regard for the honor of Allah and of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him.

The opponents of the Promised Messiah construe the expression used by him as meaning that persons to whom it was applied were the issue of adultery but it is clear that that was not his meaning as is explained in his following statement:

For proving himself legitimately born it was necessary for such a one if he considered me false and the Christians as

victorious to meet effectively the argument that I have set forth ... It is a sign of the bastard that he does not adopt the straight path and continues to love the ways of wrong and injustice. (*Anwarul Islam*, p. 30)

This expression has been metaphorically used by many eminent persons before the Promised Messiah, peace be on him. For instance, **Hazrat Imam Abu Hanifa**, may Allah have mercy on him, has said:

A person who charges Ayesha, may Allah be pleased with her, with adultery is himself the issue of adultery.

It is clear that by this expression is meant a person who is extremely wicked and vicious and not that he was begotten unlawfully.

Imam Fakharuddin Razi has stated:

An evil sperm drop produces an evil child. (*Tafsir Kabir*, Vol. VIII, p. 188)

In the same way the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, pointed out the viciousness of the people who had adopted the way of the wicked and like Imam Abu Hanifa, called them misbegotten on account of their wickedness.

In concluding we would draw attention to the following verses of the Holy Quran:

But yield thou not to any low swearer, backbiter, slanderer, forbiddor of good, transgressor, sinner, unmannerly lout and misbegotten knave, because he is wealthy and has a number of children and retainers. (Quran 68:11-15)

Reflection of All the Prophets

It is objected that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement claimed to be the manifestation and like of all prophets and had arrogated their names to himself saying that he was Adam and Noah and Ibrahim etc. He had even called himself Muhammad and Ahmad and had thus defamed the prophets.

In this connection we would draw attention to a statement by the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, which explains his claim of being the manifestation of the prophets and the champion of Allah in the mantles of the prophets. He states:

This revelation means that I have been bestowed some portion of the special circumstances or special qualities of all the prophets, peace be on them, who have appeared from God beginning with Adam till the end, whether they were Israelis by descent or non-Israelis. There has not been single prophet of whose qualities or circumstances I have not been bestowed a portion ... In this there is an indication that many people of this age resemble the bitter enemies and opponents of the prophets, peace be on them, who had exceeded the limits in their rancor and who were destroyed by various types of torments ... There has also been displayed and will be displayed in the future the various types of aid and support which God Almighty had displayed in the case of the previous prophets. (*Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya*, Part V, p. 89)

In pursuance of this explanation and in support of it we cite the statements of some of the eminent personalities of Islam.

Hazrat Shaikh Abdul Qadir Jeelani, may Allah have mercy on him, has said:

A person rises till he arrives at a station where he becomes the heir of every messenger, prophet, and *siddique*. (*Futuhul Ghaib, Maqalah 4, p. 23*)

He has also stated:

This is not the person of Abdul Qadir but the person of Muhammad. (*Guldastah Karamat p. 10*)

Hazrat Bayazid Bistami, may Allah have mercy on him, has said:

I am Ibrahim, Moses, and Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be on him. (*Tazkaratul Aulia, the Tazkarah of Bayazid Bistami*)

Imam Baqar, may Allah have mercy on him, has stated:

The Imam Mahdi will say: 'O ye people, if any of you wishes to behold Ibrahim and Ishmael, then let him note that I am Ibrahim and Ishmael. If any of you desires to behold Moses and Joshua, then let him note that I am Moses and Joshua. If any of you desires to see Isa and Simon, then let him note I am Isa and Simon. If any of you desires to behold Hazrat Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, and Ameerul Momineen Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, then let him note that I am Muhammad Mustafa, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, and Ameerul Momineen Ali, may Allah be pleased with him. (*Baharul Anwar, Vol. XIII, p. 209*)

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has called himself the like of the prophets, peace be on them, in the same sense. He states:

No one should be troubled with the idea how a humble follower of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, could become a sharer in his names and qualities or praises. Without a doubt it is true that even a prophet cannot become a sharer in an equal degree in the holy excellencies of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him. Even the angels cannot be his equals, let alone that anyone else should have any share in his excellencies. But, O seeker after truth, may Allah guide you, listen to this with attention, that God Almighty, desiring that the blessings of the Holy Prophet should continue to be manifested throughout and that the perfect rays of his light and of his acceptance by God should continue to confound his opponents and to silence them, has, of His mercy and wisdom, ordained that He manifests the blessings of His accepted Messenger through the humble personalities of some of his followers who obey him completely, with utter humility and lowliness and by falling on the threshold of servitude they are completely lost to themselves. They are so honored as God finds them utterly devoted to the Holy Prophet, so much so that they become like a clear mirror for the reflection of those blessings. The praise bestowed on them by Allah and the signs and blessings and effects that are manifested by them in reality belong to the Holy Prophet himself and issue from him. In truth and in its perfection that praise is appropriate only to the Holy Prophet and he is its perfect example, but as he who completely follows the practice of the Holy Prophet becomes a reflection of that illumined personality on account of his complete obedience and utter devotion, the divine lights that are manifested in that holy personality are also exhibited in his reflection. The manifestation in a reflection of all that characterizes the

original is a matter that is not hidden from anyone. It is true, however, that the shadow is not established in itself and does not possess any excellence in reality. Whatever is found in it is a picture of the original which is reflected through him. It is necessary, therefore, that no one should imagine that this phenomenon is derogatory of the Holy Prophet that his inner lights are reflected in his perfect followers. It should be understood that this is a reflection of the lights of the Holy Prophet which is manifested as a continuous grace in the pure personalities of the followers of the Holy Prophet. (*Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya*, Part III, p. 242)

Suspension of Jihad

One misunderstanding that is being spread abroad is that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement forbade *Jihad* to please the British Government and to procure worldly benefits from it.

Before we enter upon a refutation of this misleading propaganda it would be helpful to set forth the meaning of the concept of *Jihad*. The root of the Arabic word *Jihad* is *jahd* which connoted endurance of rigorous conditions. Thus *Jihad* means to strive to the utmost for the achievement of a purpose and to leave nothing undone in pursuance of it. The well-known lexicon *Tajul Urus* says:

The true meaning of *Jihad* is not to hold back anything and to put forth every effort and to achieve the purpose in view by forcing one-self. *Jihad* is of three types, namely, to oppose the enemy with full effort, to employ all one's faculties in opposition of Satan and to strive to the fullest that satanic designs should be altogether frustrated in the world, and to strive to the utmost in the struggle with oneself. The verse of the Holy Quran: 'Strive in the cause of Allah a perfect striving'; comprises all these three types of *Jihad*.

Thus *Jihad* is of three types. One, the *Jihad* against oneself which in Islamic idiom is called the greatest *Jihad* (*Jihad Akbar*). Two, the *Jihad* that is waged against Satan and satanic teachings and designs, and is called the great *Jihad* (*Jihad Kabeer*). Three, the *Jihad* that it waged against the enemy of freedom of conscience; this is called the lesser *Jihad* (*Jihad Asghar*). The Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, has described the striving against self as *Jihad Akbar*. It is mentioned in the *hadees*

that returning from an expedition (Tabuk), the Holy Prophet said:

We are returning from the *Jihad Asghar* (fighting) to *Jihad Akbar* (struggle against self). (*Kashaf*)

He also said:

The *mujahid* who is exalted above other *mujahids* is the one who strives against his own self.

The life of the Holy Prophet was divided into two parts, his life in Mecca and his life in Medina. During the Meccan period, he and his Companions were subjected to every kind of persecution, but they were not permitted to undertake Jihad by the sword. After the migration to Medina, God Almighty granted permission to the Muslims to oppose the aggression of their enemies by the sword. Now it is clear that every moment of the Holy Prophet's life was devoted to *Jihad*. It would be wrong to say that he did not carry out *Jihad* in the Meccan period and carried it out only during the Medina period. The truth is that every moment of his life and of the lives of his Companions was devoted to some type of *Jihad*. *Jihad* was carried on in the Meccan period, though there was no fighting and no killing of the enemy. In the Medina period, *Jihad* was continued in the same way but here *Jihad* by fighting was also added.

Let us now consider the attitude of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, towards *Jihad* by fighting. During his time British rule had been established over the subcontinent of India, also comprising what today is Pakistan. Before the British this part of the country was subject to the rule of the Sikhs who had abolished all religious freedom, especially for the Muslims, for whom it became difficult even to carry out Divine worship freely.

In this connection the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has stated:

The Muslims have not yet forgotten the time when, at the hands of Sikhs, they were condemned to a blazing oven and not only was their world in ruins but their religion was even in worse case. It was difficult for them to carry their religious obligations, so much so that on one occasion a Muslim was killed for calling out the *Azan* (call to Prayers). (*Announcement of 10 July 1900*)

It has been observed that the Sikhs were inspired with great hatred of the Muslims. Muslim men, women and children were mercilessly slaughtered; their villages were ruined; their women were dishonored and thousands of mosques were demolished. (*Encyclopedia of Sikh Literature*, p. 1127).

After British rule replaced Sikh rule in this part of the country a *darbar* was held in Allahabad on 1 November 1858 in which it was announced on behalf of Queen Victoria:

We proclaim that it is our royal will and pleasure that no one of our subjects shall be persecuted or granted any favor on account of his religious beliefs or practices, nor shall any person be deprived of his security. In the eye of the law all people shall be equally entitled to impartial protection.

In these circumstances, when unlike the Sikhs the British Government did not consider the Muslims as deserving to be killed and they were granted complete religious freedom of profession and practice, the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, announced:

Government has granted to every people full freedom for the propagation of their respective faiths and in this way people have been provided with an opportunity to study and reflect upon the principles of every religion ... that is the reason why we, in our writings and our speeches, make mention of the beneficence of the British Government. (*Roedad Jalsa Dua*)

In his booklet *Tohfa Qaisariyya*, the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, explained the doctrine of *Jihad* as follows:

The second principle on which I have been established is the clarification of the doctrine of *Jihad* which has been misinterpreted by some ignorant Muslims. I have been made to understand by God Almighty that those practices that are currently regarded as *Jihad* are entirely opposed to the teachings of the Holy Quran. There is no doubt that the Holy Quran permitted the Muslims to fight under directions that were more reasonable than those relating to the battles of Moses and were more attractive than those related to the battles of Joshua, son of Nun. They had their origin in the fact that those who had taken up the sword unjustly against the Muslims and committed murder and carried on their tyranny to the extreme deserved to be punished by the sword. Nevertheless, this punishment was not so severe as was inflicted upon the enemy in the battles of Moses. A person who accepted Islam or agreed to pay the poll tax was exempt from punishment and this method was in accord with the law of nature... In short, at the time of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, the basis of Islamic *Jihad* was that God's wrath had been roused against the tyrants. But living under the rule of a benign government, as is the Government of our Queen and

Empress, it is not *Jihad* to entertain rebellious designs against it but it is a barbaric idea which is born of ignorance. To entertain ill-will against a government under whom life is lived in freedom and there is complete security and religious obligations can be discharged to the full is a criminal step and not *Jihad*... Thus, God Almighty had established me on the principle that sincere obedience and gratitude should be rendered to a benign government such as the British Government. My Community and I are bound by this principle. I have written several books in Arabic, Persian and Urdu on this question and have expounded in them in detail how the Muslims of British India lead their lives in comfort under the British Government and how they can freely propagate their faith and discharge their religious obligations without let or hindrance and how wrongful and rebellious it is to entertain any idea of *Jihad* against this blessed and peace-loving Government. (*Tohfah Qaisariyya*, pp. 9-10)

This makes it clear that in the view of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, there was no ground for undertaking *Jihad* by the sword against the Government in India as none of the conditions of *Jihad* operated in India.

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, was not alone in holding the view that *Jihad* by the sword was not permitted against the British Government in India. All the eminent divines of his time made declarations to the same effect and in accordance with them refrained from any activity which might be construed as *Jihad* by the sword and thus confirmed their declarations by their conduct. By way of illustration we set out some of these declarations.

1. Maulvi Muhammad Husain Sahib of Batala, one of the outstanding leaders of the Ahle Hadees, declared:

‘It is not permissible for the Muslims to fight, or to help with men and money those who fight, against a Government of whatever religion, whether Jewish, Christian, or other, under whom they live in security and are free to discharge their religious obligations, Accordingly, for the Muslims of India, Opposition to or rebellion against the British Government is forbidden.’ (*Ishaatus Sunna*, Vol. VI, No. 10)

The same divine urged:

Brethren, this is no longer the time of the sword. It has now become necessary to use the pen in place of the sword. (*Ishaatus Sunnah*, Vol. VI, No.12)

2. Maulvi Muhammad Jafar Sahib of Thanesar, has recorded in his well-known biography of Hazrat Syed Ahmad Sahib Brelvi, the Reformer of the 13th century of Islam:

It is a correct statement that when he was proceeding on *Jihad* against the Sikhs someone asked him why did he propose to go so far to carry out *Jihad* against the Sikhs? Why did he not start *Jihad* against the British, who are the rulers of this country and deny the truth of Islam? He could fight them at home and take over India from them. He would have the support of hundreds of thousands in this enterprise. To travel to Afghanistan through hundreds of miles of Sikh territory and to remain there for years for fighting the Sikhs is a design so difficult that the people are not willing to adopt it. To this Syed Sahib made answer that he did not desire to take over any country from the British or from the Sikhs and to rule over it himself. The only reason why he designed to carry out *Jihad* against the Sikhs

was that they oppress the Muslims and obstruct them in the performance of their religious obligations like calling out the *Azan*. If at this time or after the establishment of his supremacy the Sikhs refrain from persecuting the Muslims, he would no longer have any cause to fight them. The British are non-Muslims but they do not oppress the Muslims in any way, nor do they obstruct them in the performance of their religious obligations and worship. The Muslims openly propagate their faith and practice their religion under them. They not only do not forbid or obstruct the Muslims in any of this but are ready to punish anyone who might commit any aggression against the Muslims. He affirmed that his real purpose was the propagation of the Unity of God and the revival of the practice of the Chief of the Messengers, and that under the British he carried out this purpose without any hindrance. Then why should he start *Jihad* against the Government and should shed the blood of both sides contrary to the principles of religion. On hearing this reply, his interrogator held his peace having understood the true purpose of *Jihad*. (*Biography of Hazrat Syed Ahmad*, p. 71)

At another place Maulvi Muhammad Jafar Sahib has stated:

It is also correctly related that while Maulana Ismail Shaheed was delivering a sermon during his stay in Calcutta, someone asked him whether it was proper to carry out *Jihad* against the British Government. In reply the Maulana said it was not permissible to carry on *Jihad* against such an impartial and non-bigoted Government. On the other hand, the tyranny of the Sikhs in the Punjab had reached a stage where it called for *Jihad* against them. (*Biography of Hazrat Syed Ahmad*, p. 57)

3. Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Sahib of Batala wrote:

At this time all the conditions of *Jihad* are nonexistent. Therefore, in India, from Calcutta to Peshawar, and from Sindh to the Deccan, no one is at liberty to carry on *jihad* against the British Government. (*Ishaatus Sunnah*, Vol. IX, No. I)

4. Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Founder of the Aligarh College, wrote in 1885:

The vigorous conspiring of the Muslims and their consulting together that they should unite in carrying out *Jihad* against non-Muslims and should win their freedom from the Government is an utterly baseless thing. The Muslims enjoy complete security under the Government and can in no wise carry on *Jihad* against it. Twenty or thirty years ago a very well-known Maulvi, Muhammad Ismael, preached *Jihad* in India and urged people to join in it. At that time he stated quite clearly that the people of India who live in security under the British Government have no cause to carry on *Jihad* against that Government. (*Causes of the Indian Rebellion*, p. 104)

5. Maulvi Murtaza Ahmad Khan Sahib has recorded that the Khalifatul Muslimeen Sultan Abdul Hameed II of Turkey communicated a declaration to the British that the Muslims of India should not fight the British as they had proved to be the allies of and in sympathy with the Islamic Khilafat. (*History of the Nations of the World*, p. 639)

6. Maulvi Syed Nazir Hussain Sahib Delhvi declared:

As the conditions of *Jihad* do not exist in this country it would be ruin and sinful to carry on *Jihad* here. (*Fatawa Naziriyya*, Vol. IV, p. 472)

He also declared that the rebellion of 1857 was not *Jihad* under the Islamic law but was a faithless proceeding involving a breach of covenant and disorder and rancor and that participation in it or any assistance rendered towards it was sinful. (*Ishaatus Sunnah*, Vol. VI, No. 10)

7. Maulana Maudoodi Sahib declared:

When the Muslims were defeated and the British Government was established and the Muslims were content to live in this country with freedom to practise their personal law, this country ceased to be a country at war. (*Book on Interest*, p. 1)

All this shows that all serious minded Muslims have been grateful to the British Government who rescued them from the oppression and religious persecution of the Sikhs and gave them complete religious freedom. Muslim divines were united in declaring that it was not permissible to enter upon *Jihad* against the British. They did not confine themselves to declarations, but confirmed them by their conduct that the conditions of *Jihad* did not exist in India and *Jihad* was not permissible against the British. Had that not been so, the Muslim divines of India would surely have raised the banner of *Jihad* against the British.

If our opponents believe that *Jihad* had become obligatory against the British in India, then they are guilty of the charge that they failed to carry out this obligation. According to the Ahmadiyya Community the causes and conditions of *Jihad* were non-existent in India and therefore *Jihad* was not obligatory on them and by not embarking on it they were not guilty of any default. But those who believe that they are under an obligation and then commit a default in respect of it are certainly sinners.

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, set forth the true Islamic teaching concerning *Jihad*. He states:

Without a doubt the causes of *Jihad* do not exist in this country in these days. Therefore, the Muslims of this country are today forbidden to fight in the name of religion and to slaughter those who reject the Islamic law. God Almighty has clearly forbidden *Jihad* by the sword in a time of peace and security. (*Tohfah Golarvia*, p. 82)

It is obvious that no divine can hold *Jihad* lawful at a time when its conditions do not exist.

It must be remembered that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, did not forbid *Jihad* absolutely. He argued his Community to carry *Jihad* all the time. He states:

The *Jihad* of this age is to strive in upholding the word of Islam, to refute the objections of the opponents, to propagate the excellences of the Islamic faith, and to proclaim the truth of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, throughout the world. This is *Jihad* till God Almighty brings about other conditions in the world. (*Letter addressed to Mir Nasir Nawab Sahib*)

In this letter the words:

Till God Almighty brings about other conditions in the world

are worthy of note. They clearly indicate that he did not reject the concept of *Jihad* by the sword but believed that the obligation of such *Jihad* had been postponed in this age on account of the absence of the conditions that call for it. He did not abrogate *Jihad* by the sword, nor could he do so as he was bound by the Holy Quran. He merely declared its postponement. He cited the

hadees that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, had prophesied that the Promised Messiah would not fight with the sword as his age would be a time of religious freedom.

Finally, we would draw attention to a statement of Hazrat Khalifatul Masih II which explains the attitude of the Ahmadiyya Community towards *Jihad*. He states:

As the *salat* is obligatory so, when the need arises, is fighting for the faith obligatory ... It should be remembered that of the matters which have prescribed as the principal constituents of faith, one is *Jihad* ... He who turns away from *Jihad* when it becomes obligatory is condemned to hell. (*Report of the Majlis Mushawarat*, 1950)

At a time when the conditions for *Jihad* by the sword did not exist the Ahmadiyya Community eagerly carried out *Jihad* with the Holy Quran, which has been called the Great *Jihad*, and *Jihad* against their own selves, which has been called the Greatest *Jihad*. They continue to refute the Christian and Arya Samajist opponents of Islam. After the establishment of Pakistan, when the Dogra forces and the Indian army were suppressing the Muslims of Kashmir, the Ahmadiyya Community of Pakistan was the only one that raised a volunteer corps called the Furqan Force to fight in Kashmir along with the army of Pakistan and thus carried out *Jihad* by sword in practice. Several young men of the Furqan Force became martyrs in this fighting. Thus, when the time came for *Jihad* by the sword the Ahmadiyya Community participated in it at once and should the conditions of *Jihad* by the sword arise again, the Ahmadiyya Community will, God willing, not hesitate to discharge the obligation of *Jihad* by the sword.

Prophecy Relating to Muhammadi Begum

One of the objections of the opponents of Ahmadiyyat is that the Founder of the Movement had made a prophecy that Muhammadi Begum, daughter of Mirza Ahmad Beg, would be married to him, but that the marriage did not take place and this prophecy was proved false.

The background of this prophecy was that some of the relatives of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, were atheists and mocked at Islam. God Almighty designed to show them a sign so that those who might take advantage of it may be saved and those who might reject it may be punished. Their condition is depicted by him as follows:

God Almighty found my cousins and other relatives a prey to irreligious thinking and given to misconduct. They were held in the grip of their passions, denied the existence of God and were disorderly. (*Ayyanah Kamalat Islam*, p. 566)

He states further:

It so happened that one evening a person came to me weeping and I became apprehensive and asked him whether he had received the news of the death of anyone. To this he replied in the negative and said that the matter was graver than that. He explained that he had been sitting with those people who have become apostates from the divine faith and one of them uttered vile abuse against the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, such as has not been heard even from the mouth of a disbeliever. He mentioned that these people dishonor the Holy Quran and utter things that one

dare not repeat. They assert that there is no God and that the concept of God is an imposture. Having heard him I reminded him that I had already warned him against keeping company with such people. (*Ayenah Kamalat Islam*, p. 568)

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, further states:

These people wrote a letter to me in which they reviled the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and denied the existence of God and demanded proofs of my truth and of the existence of God. They published this letter and supported the non-Muslims of India and exhibited extreme wickedness. (*Ayenah Kamalat Islam*, p. 568)

On their demanding a sign, the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, turned to prayer and supplicated earnestly for a Divine sign to be exhibited in respect of them. God Almighty responded to him and he received the revelation:

I have observed their misconduct and wickedness and I shall soon destroy them under heaven through different types of calamities and you will soon see how I shall deal with them. I have power to do all that I will, I shall make their women widows and their children orphans and shall ruin their homes so that they might be punished for their misdeeds. I shall not destroy them at one stroke but gradually so that they might *turn* back and repent. My curse will descend upon the walls of their homes, on their elders and their young ones, on their women and on their men and on their guests. All of them will be accursed except those who believe and cut asunder from them and keep away from their company. They will be under divine mercy. (*Ayenah Kamalat Islam*, p. 569)

About that time the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, was approached by one of these relatives of his to procure his consent on deed of gift, the details of which are set out by him as follows:

At that time Mirza Ahmad Beg, father of Muhammadi Begum, made up his mind to procure from his sister, whose husband had not been heard of for several years, a gift of her land in favor of his son. The husband of his sister was a cousin of ours and under the customary law she could not transfer her land without our consent as we were the collateral's of her husband. Mirza Ahmad Beg, therefore, turned to me and humbly and respectfully requested me to indicate my consent to the transfer proposed by him and I became inclined to put my signature to the deed of gift. But, as was my habit, I prayed for guidance, whereupon, I received a revelation to the following effect:

‘Tell him to establish a relationship with you by giving his elder daughter in marriage to you and thus to obtain light from your light. Tell him that you would agree to the transfer of the land as he has requested and show him other favors in the event of this marriage taking place. Tell him that this would be a covenant between you and that if he accepts it he will find you the best acceptor on your side and that if he does not accept it and his daughter is married to someone else that marriage would not prove a blessing either for his daughter or for himself. Tell him that if he persists in carrying out any different design he will become subject to a series of misfortunes, the last of which would be his death within three years of the marriage of his daughter to someone else. Warn him that his death is near and will occur at a

time when he does not expect it. The husband of his daughter will also die within two years and a half. This is a divine decree.'

I told him that he could now proceed to do whatever he might wish and that I had warned him. (*Ayenah Kamalat Islam*, p. 572)

This was the prophecy, which was conditional upon repentance. In fact every prophecy that warns of punishment is conditioned with repentance. That this was so in this case also is clear from the revelation that the Promised Messiah received on seeing Muhammadi Begum's maternal grandmother in a vision and in which he addressed her:

Woman, do thou repent. Repent, for misfortune is about to overtake thee and thy progeny and their progeny. A person wilt die but many critics will remain who will indulge in wild language. (*Announcement of 10 July 1888*)

The real purpose of the prophecy appears from the following statement of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him:

I had no need to request this relationship. God Almighty had fulfilled all my needs. He had bestowed children upon me and had promised that He would bestow upon me, within a short period, a son who would serve as a lamp for the faith and would be named Mahmud Ahmad. He would prove to be of high resolve in his endeavors. The request for this relationship is merely as a sign so that God Almighty might demonstrate His wonderful power to the dissidents of this family; so that if they accept, God might bestow signs of blessings and mercy upon them and might avert the misfortunes that are approaching and that if they reject it He might warn

them through His wrathful signs. (*Announcement* of 15 July 1888)

It is clear, therefore, that the misfortune that threatened Muhammadi Begum's maternal grandmother and Muhammadi Begum herself could be averted by repentance, as is indicated by the opening words of the revelation: *Repent, Repent*.

So it happened that Muhammadi Begum's father gave her in marriage to another person and in accordance with the prophecy died within six months of the marriage and his death deeply affected the other members of the family. Muhammadi Begum's husband repented and turned to God and thus his death was averted. As the prophecy was conditioned with repentance and on his repenting, the death of Muhammadi Begum's husband was averted, her marriage to the Promised Messiah was canceled and did not take place.

It might be asked what is there to show that Muhammadi Begum's husband, Mirza Sultan Muhammad, had really repented and had turned to God. In reply to this the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, states:

The determination of this is quite easy. Ask Sultan Muhammad, the son-in-law of Ahmad Beg, that he should publish a denial. Thereafter, if he should not die within a period that God Almighty might specify, I would be proved false ... Such death would be withheld from him till he becomes defiant. Thus if you are in a hurry then arise and make him announce his denial and then witness the power of God Almighty. (*Anjam Aatham*, p. 32)

If, after this challenge Mirza Sultan Muhammad had exhibited any defiance or had, at the urging of others, announced his denial, his death within the period that might have been

appointed would have been absolutely inescapable and Muhammadi Begum's marriage to the Promised Messiah would have taken place.

On the publication of the challenge of the Promised Messiah set out in *Anjam Aatham*, some Christians approached Mirza Sultan Muhammad and promised to pay him a large amount of money so that he might prosecute the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, in respect of his challenge. But they were unable to persuade him to take any such step, despite the tempting offer made to him.

In 1912 Mirza Sultan Muhammad wrote in a letter, a photostat of which has been published several times by the Ahmadiyya Community:

I have always held the late Mirza Sahib, and still hold him, as a righteous and respected person who was a servant of Islam, had a noble spirit and was constant in his remembrance of God. I entertain no opposition to his followers and regret that for certain reasons I was not able to have the honor of meeting him in his lifetime.

Hafiz Jamal Ahmad Sahib, a missionary of the Ahmadiyya Movement had, on one occasion, an interview with Mirza Sultan Muhammad, husband of Muhammadi Begum, which was published in the *Al-Fazal* of 9-13 June 1921, in the lifetime of Mirza Sultan Muhammad. Hafiz Ahmad Sahib states as follows:

If you would not mind, I would like to ask you about the prophecy of Hazrat Mirza Sahib concerning his marriage. He replied: 'You can ask me freely'; and on my putting the question to him he stated: 'My father-in-law, Mirza Ahmad Beg Sahib, died in accordance with the prophecy, but God Almighty is

Forgiving and Merciful and hears the supplications of His servants and has mercy on them.'

He was asked: 'Have you any comments on the prophecy of Mirza Sahib, or did it raise any doubts in your mind?' to which he replied:

'The prophecy raised no doubts in my mind. I state on oath that the faith and belief that I have in Hazrat Sahib are, I conceive, stronger than that of those of you who have entered into a covenant of allegiance with him.'

Thus the turning back of Mirza Sultan Muhammad Sahib is clear and obvious. As the prophecy was conditional, its remaining portions were averted through repentance after the death of Mirza Ahmad Beg. These included Muhammadi Begum's marriage to the Promised Messiah after the death of Mirza Sultan Muhammad. As his death was deferred, the question of any other marriage did not arise. As the Promised Messiah has stated:

When these people fulfilled the condition and the son-in-law of Ahmad Beg became afraid and repented, the marriage was canceled or postponed. (*Tatimmah Haqeeqatul Wahi*, p. 32)

He has stated further:

Everyone is aware of the events of the people of Jonah where there was no condition and yet the punishment decreed for them was averted by repentance and asking of forgiveness. In the present case there was the clear admonition: 'Repent, repent, for the calamity is on thy heels'; which meant that everything would be averted

through repentance. They were put in fear and thus a part of the prophecy was averted. (*Badr*, 13 April 1908)

The effect of the prophecy was that God Almighty delivered a large number of the members of that family and brought them into the Ahmadiyya Movement and made them devoted Muslims. Out of a long list of those members of this family who have joined the Movement, we call attention to a statement made in a letter by Mirza Ishaq Beg, son of Muhammadi Begum, who, by God's grace, is a member of the Ahmadiyya Movement. He has said:

In accordance with this prophecy, my maternal grandfather, Mirza Ahmad Beg, died and the rest of the family was put in fear and became inclined towards reform, the irrefutable proof of which is that most of them joined the Ahmadiyya Movement in consequence of which God Almighty, being Forgiving and Merciful, changed His wrath into mercy. (*Al-Fazal*, 26 February 1923)

One objection that is raised in connection with this prophecy is that the Promised Messiah stated in *Izalah Auham* in 1891:

God Almighty will in any event bring Muhammadi Begum to me as a virgin or a widow and will remove all obstructions. He will certainly fulfill this and no one can obstruct Him. (*Izalah Auham*, p. 296)

Then how is it possible that God Almighty did not remove the intervening obstructions and the marriage did not take place? The answer is that this statement was an interpretation of the prophecy, though it does not mention the condition to which the prophecy was subject. This condition was expressly laid down as has already been pointed out, If after his repentance Mirza Sultan Muhammad had rescinded from it then all intervening

obstructions would have been removed. But, as in the event, Mirza Sultan Muhammad fulfilled the condition of repentance and adhered to it throughout, the remaining portions of the prophecy could not come into operation.

Health of the Promised Messiah

It is objected that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, has said that he suffered from hypochondria (*Badr*, 7 June 1906), and that Hazrat Bashir Ahmed Sahib in *Seeratul Mahdi*, Vol. 1, p. 13, wrote that he was subject to hysteria and it is argued that a person suffering from hypochondria cannot be a prophet.

The Promised Messiah has nowhere stated himself that he suffered from hypochondria or hysteria. The statement in *Badr* of 7 June 1906 does not set out his own words. It is a statement by the diary writer, the accuracy of which could be open to doubt. There is a very clear statement by the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, concerning the Divine safeguarding of his health which is as follows:

In the same way God Almighty knew that if I were to be afflicted with some objectionable disease like leprosy, lunacy, blindness, epilepsy etc., my opponents would conclude that I was the subject of Divine wrath. Therefore, He gave me the good news in advance, as is mentioned in the *Barahin-e-Ahmadiyya*, that He would safeguard me against every objectionable disease and would complete His favor unto me. (*Arbaeen*, No. 3, p. 30)

Thus, he was not at all afflicted with hypochondria, or hysteria, or epilepsy, or any such disease. It is true that Hazrat Mirza Bashir Ahmed Sahib mentioned in the *Seeratul Mahdi* that the Ummul Momineen had mentioned that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, suffered from hysteria, but the Ummul Momineen was not a physician and she described migraine, to which the Promised Messiah was liable, as hysteria. No argument can be based on her mistaken use of this expression.

It is true that he was subject to migraine and in this connection it is worthy of note that there is high medical authority for the statement that the subjects of migraine are nearly always of an active, capable, and intelligent type (*Price's Text Book of Medicine*, p. 1502). Thus there is nothing objectionable about migraine.

This kind of objection is not new. Bigoted Christian ministers have been guilty of charging the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, with epilepsy. The Holy Quran has repeatedly mentioned that the opponents of the Prophets called them insane and sorcerers, etc. It was, therefore, necessary that the Promised Messiah, like other true prophets, should have been made the subject of such charges, which are a proof of his truth and righteousness.

Challenge to Maulvi Sanaullah

One objection is raised that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement had offered a prayer in opposition to Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib that of the two, the one who was in the wrong should die in the lifetime of the one who was in the right and as the former died in the lifetime of the latter it follows that he was in the wrong.

The truth of the matter is that among the divines who had been challenged to a prayer duel (*mubahilah*) by the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, in his book *Anjam Aatham*, Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib's name was also included. He was, however, afraid to take up the challenge and never indicated any inclination towards accepting it; but possibly under some pressure on the side of the non-Ahmadi public, he challenged the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, to a prayer duel (*mubahilah*) in his paper the *Ahle Hadees* of 29 March 1907. With reference to this challenge the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, wrote in his book *Ijaz Ahmadi*:

I have seen the announcement of Maulvi Sanaullah of Amritsar in which he claims that has a sincere desire that he and I should pray that the one of us who is in the wrong should die in the lifetime of the one who is in the right.

He added:

He has made a good proposal, I trust he will keep to it.
(*Ijaz Ahmadi*, p. 14)

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, accepted this challenge of Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib and announced:

If he is sincere in his challenge that the untruthful one should die before the truthful one then surely he will be the first to die. (*Ijaz Ahmadi*, p. 36)

When Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib found that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, had accepted his challenge to a prayer duel (*mubahilah*) he was overcome by fear and began to make excuses. He wrote:

I neither am nor do I claim like you that I am a prophet, or a messenger, or a son of God, or a recipient of revelation. I cannot, therefore, dare to enter into such a contest. Your purpose is that if I should die before you, you will proclaim that as a proof of your righteousness and if you pass on before me (a good riddance), then who will go to your grave to call you to account? That is why you put forward such stupid proposals. I regret, however, that I dare not enter into such controversy and this lack of courage is a source of honor for me and is not a source of humiliation. (*Ilhamat Mirza*, p. 116)

This declaration by Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib came as a great shock to his followers and he was subjected to heavy adverse criticism, whereby he was moved to proclaim:

Followers of the Mirza, if you are truthful, come forward and bring your leader with you. The same place, namely, the Idgah of Amritsar, where you have previously experienced heavenly humiliation in a prayer duel with Sufi Abdul Haq Ghaznavi, is still there. So bring him who has challenged us to a prayer duel in his book *Anjam Aatham* and confront him with me, for so long as there is no final decision with the prophet nothing can bind all his followers. (*Ahl-i-Hadees*, 29 March 1907)

Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib might have hoped that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, would pay no attention to his hyperbolic boast and that he would thus extricate himself from an unpleasant situation. However, when the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, read this announcement of his, he directed the Editor of *Badr* to announce:

In reply to his challenge I wish to convey to Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib the good news that Hazrat Mirza Sahib (the Promised Messiah) has accepted his challenge. (*Badr*, 4 April 1907)

This announcement upset Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib and being frightened he announced:

I have not challenged you to a *mubahilah*, I have only declared my willingness to take an oath, but you call it a *mubahilah*, whereas a *mubahilah* involves the parties taking oaths in a contest against each other. I have declared my readiness to take an oath and have not issued a challenge to a *mubahilah*. Taking an unilateral oath is one thing and *mubahilah* is quite another. (*Ahle Hadees*, 19 April 1907)

Perceiving that Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib was not prepared to take a definite stand, the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, published an announcement under the heading:

Final decision concerning Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib, and concluded it with the statement:

Now Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib may write in response whatever he pleases. In case he accepts the challenge to a *mubahilah* he should record his acceptance of it over his signature.

In answer to this, Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib wrote as follows:

The Quran says that the evil-doers are granted respite by God. For instance, it is said: 'The Gracious One grants respite to those who are in error' (19:76); and: 'We grant them respite so that they might multiply their sins' (3:97); 'God will leave them to flounder on in their transgression' (2:16); and: 'The fact is that We provided for them and their fathers and they remained in enjoyment of Our provision for a long time' (21 :45). All these clearly mean that God Almighty, grants respite and bestows long life on liars, deceivers, disturbers of the peace and disobedient ones, so that during the period of respite they should add to their evil deeds. (*Ahle Hadees*, 26 April 1907)

Thus Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib not only rejected the challenge of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, to a mubahilah, but also put forward a principle that liars, deceivers, disorderly people and disobedient ones are granted long life. Thereupon God Almighty granted long life to Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib according to the principle which he had put forward and brought about the death of the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, thus confirming that according to his own declaration Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib was a disorderly and disobedient person and was a liar and a deceiver.

Prayer Services Led by a Non-Ahmadi Muslim

One of the objections that is raised against the Ahmadiyya Community is that they do not join the prayer services of the non-Ahmadi, nor do they participate in the funeral prayers for a non-Ahmadi and that for this reason they are not Muslims.

In approaching this question it is necessary to keep in mind its history. It is well known and cannot be denied that it was the non-Ahmadis and their divines who debarred the Ahmadis from joining their Prayer services and even forbade their entry into their mosques. If an Ahmadi was found saying his prayers in a mosque of the non-Ahmadis, he was beaten up and often the floor of the mosque where an Ahmadi might have said his prayers was washed and thus the mosque was purified from the pollution which, according to them, had been inflicted upon the mosque by the entry of an Ahmadi into it. The Ahmadis were regarded as a pollution. It was in this situation that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement directed his followers to arrange to hold their prayer services separately and thus avoid all occasion of disorderliness in mosques. It is worthy of note that no non-Ahmadi has ever been stopped from joining the prayer services of Ahmadis or from saying his prayers separately in an Ahmadi mosque.

It was not till 1900, eleven years after the foundation of the Movement, that the Ahmadis were directed not to join the prayer services of the non-Ahmadis. Non-Ahmadi divines had throughout this period continued the condemnation of the Ahmadis as non-Muslims and outside the pale of Islam. It will thus be realized that the non-Ahmadis first forbade the entry of Ahmadis into their mosques and then charged them with failure to join the prayer services.

Attention may be drawn, by way of illustration, to a few of the declarations of non-Ahmadi divines in this context.

1. Maulvi Nazir Hussain Sahib of Delhi declared that neither the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement nor any of his followers should be greeted with the Islamic Salutation or invited to a meal, nor should their invitation to a meal be accepted, nor should prayers be said in the leadership of any of them. (Fatwa published in 1892 in the *Ishaatus Sunnah*, Vol. XIII, p. 85)
2. Maulvi Muhammad Hussain Sahib of Batala declared that to be a follower of the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement and to lead the Muslims in prayers is a contradiction which cannot be reconciled. (*Sharai Faislah*, p. 31)
3. Maulvi Rashid Ahmad Sahib Gangohi declared that it is forbidden to join a prayer service led by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement or any of his followers. (*Sharai Faislah*, p. 31)
4. Maulvi Sanaullah Sahib of Amritsar declared that whatever the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement did was all done for worldly purposes and that it was not permissible to join a prayer service led by him. (*Fatwa Shariat Gharra*, p. 9)
5. Mufti Muhammad Abdullah Sahib Tonki of Lahore declared that it was not permissible to join a prayer service led by the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement or any of his followers. (*Sharai Faislah*, p. 25)
6. Maulvi Abdur Rehman Sahib Bihari declared that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement was a disbeliever and an apostate from Islam and that joining a prayer service

led by him or any of his followers was a useless and condemnable practice. The obligation of participation in a prayer service was not thereby discharged and such a worshipper incurred a great sin. It amounted to the same thing as joining a prayer service led by a Jew. (*Fatawa Shariat Gharra*, p. 4)

7. Maulvi Khalil Ahmad Sahib of Saharanpur declared that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement repudiated the Holy Quran and was outside the pale of Islam. To enter into a covenant of allegiance with him or to have any love for him or to join in a prayer service led by him or any of his followers was improper and was strictly forbidden. (*Fatawa Shariat Gharra*, p. 7)

8. Maulvi Ahmad Raza Khan of Bareilli declared that to join a prayer service led by a member of the Ahmadiyya Movement, or to join his funeral prayer, or to enter into a matrimonial alliance with him, or to eat the meat of an animal slaughtered by him, or to keep company with him, or to talk to him, was subject to the same discipline as applied to the apostates from Islam. (*Hissamul Haramain*, p. 95)

These declarations were widely published and were read out in the mosque of cities, towns and villages throughout the subcontinent and thus the entry of Ahmadis into the mosques of the non-Ahmadis was forbidden and condemned. If in consequence of all this the Ahmadis were directed by the Head of the Movement that they should not join the prayer services of non-Ahmadis, such action was only perfectly appropriate but was called for in the interest of avoiding disorderliness in the mosques.

The same was the situation with regard to the funeral services and burial of deceased Ahmadis. Numerous declarations were

made by non-Ahmadi divines that non-Ahmadis should not join the funeral prayers of an Ahmadi and should not permit an Ahmadi to be buried in their graveyards. The bodies of deceased Ahmadis awaiting burial were shamefully treated, and in many cases they were disinterred after burial and thrown away. There is scarcely any disgrace or dishonor that could be inflicted upon a dead body to which the dead bodies of the Ahmadis were not subjected. Having suffered such indignities it is not a matter for surprise, far less of condemnation, that the Ahmadis refrained from joining in the funeral prayers of non-Ahmadis. This was also appropriate in order to avoid disorderliness and provocation.

By way of illustration here are some instances of the sort of treatment which has been accorded by non-Ahmadis to the dead bodies of members of the Ahmadiyya Movement:

1. On 20 August 1915, a small child of K. S. Hasan, an Ahmadi of Cannanore, Malabar, died and the local ruler directed that as the local Qazi had issued a declaration against the Ahmadis, that they were disbelievers, the dead body of the child could not be interred in any graveyard of the Muslims. The child could not be buried that day and at the end of the following day was buried in a plot of land more than two miles distant from the Muslim graveyard. (*Al-Fazal*, 19 October 1915).
2. In December 1918, the wife of an Ahmadi of Cuttack, Orissa, died and the Ahmadis buried the dead body in the Muslim graveyard. When the non-Ahmadis learnt of this they disinterred the body and carried it and threw it at the door of her husband's house (*Al-Fazal*, 14 December 1918). The situation in Cuttack might be appreciated from the following extract from *Ahle Hadees*, a non-Ahmadi paper, which said:

The proverb 'A hundred stripes for a corpse' is being put into practice here. The situation with reference to an Ahmadi corpse is indescribable. When it is known in the town that an Ahmadi has died all graveyards are put under guard with people armed with sticks and the corpse is subjected to all sorts of indignities. A search is made for a coffin but it cannot be procured, gravediggers refuse to dig the grave, wood and bamboos become scarce. Search is made for a place for burial and none is found. Being disappointed in every direction when the relatives of the dead person decide to bury the corpse inside the house someone goes and informs the municipal authorities of this design and they appear immediately on the scene and frustrate the design. (*Ahle Hadees*, as quoted in *Al-Fazal* of February 9, 1918)

3. In April 1928, the opponents of the Ahmadiyya Movement in Cuttack stopped the burial of the small child of an Ahmadi even in the graveyard which the Ahmadis had established in a plot obtained from the government for the purpose, and the local officials rendered no assistance to the Ahmadis in carrying out the burial. (*Al-Fazal*, 13 April 1928)
4. On 16 March 1928, the daughter of Shaikh Sher Muhammad, an Ahmadi of Bhadrak, Orissa, could not be buried in the graveyard on account of the opposition offered by non-Ahmadis who had gathered in large numbers and were bent upon using violence to stop the burial. In the end the father arranged to place the dead body in a coffin and buried it in the compound of his house. (*Al-Fazal*, 27 April 1928)
5. On 29 January 1934, an Ahmadi died in Calicut, Malabar and non-Ahmadi opponents made a great propaganda in

the town that the dead body should not be permitted to be buried in the Muslim graveyard. Thousands of excited opponents collected around the house of the deceased and created so much disturbance that it became difficult for the Ahmadis to enter the house or to emerge from it. With great difficulty at about 5 p.m. one person was sent to the graveyard to spy out the situation there, and on his return he reported that thousands of people armed with sticks etc. had gathered at the graveyard and were proclaiming that they would under no circumstances permit the dead body of the deceased Ahmadi to be buried in the grave-yard. The local officials were approached, but they pleaded their helplessness in the situation. Finally, on the following day, at 10.30 p.m., the corpse was buried at a great distance from the town in a plot of land that was subject to inundation in the rainy season. (*Al-Fazal*, 25 February 1934).

Hundreds of such instances can be cited but considerations of space forbid further citation. The indignities offered to the dead bodies of Ahmadi martyrs in various places in Pakistan during the disturbances in 1974 are fresh in the memory of all.

In view of all this does it lie in the mouths of our opponents that they should consider us blameworthy in that we do not join them in the funeral prayers of non-Ahmadi deceased?

This question has another aspect. Non-Ahmadi divines argue that as Ahmadis do not join non-Ahmadis in prayer services they thereby put themselves outside the pale of Islam. Now there is no sect of Muslims which has not been condemned as disbelievers by Muslim divines and joining whose prayer services is not regarded as contrary to Islam. Thus this is not a new situation which has arisen only with reference to the Ahmadis. Apply the same reasoning to other Muslim sects and consider the situation that would result therefrom. If the Ahmadis become disbelievers

by not joining the prayer services of the non-Ahmadis, the same would apply to other sects who declare it contrary of Islam and forbidden to join the prayer services of each other other.

Here are some illustrations. The principal non-Ahmadi divines have declared concerning the Devbandees as follows:

Those of the Devband sect are absolute apostates from Islam and are disbelievers because in their worship they defame and dishonor all prophets and saints and even the Holy Prophet of Islam, on whom be the peace and blessings of Allah, and God Almighty Himself ... The Muslims should avoid them altogether and not only should they refrain from joining them in their prayer services but they should not permit them to participate in their own prayer services, nor should they permit them to enter their mosques or eat the meat of animals slaughtered by them or take part in their marriage celebrations or funeral services. They should not visit them in illness and should not participate in their burial after death, nor permit the corpses of those of them who die to be buried in Muslim graveyards.

Those of the Devbandee sect are thus confirmed apostates and disbelievers, such that those who doubt in their being disbelievers would themselves become disbelievers, with the consequence that their marriages would be automatically dissolved and if they continue their association with their wives, any children born of such association would be illegitimate and would not inherit from them under the law. (*Fatwa of Maulvi Muhammad Ibrahim Sahib of Bhagalpur, printed in the Hasan Barqi Press, Luknow*)

In view of this, are Ahmadis under any obligation to join the prayer services of the Devbandee sect or should they join the prayer services of the Brelvis, concerning whom it has been declared:

He who attributes the knowledge of the unseen to anyone except God Almighty or considers anyone as possessing the same degree of knowledge as is possessed by God Almighty is undoubtedly a disbeliever. His leadership in prayer, association with him, love and friendship for him are all forbidden. (*Fatawa Rashidiyyah Kamil of Maulvi Rashid Ahmad Sahib Gangohi*)

Or is it desired that the Ahmadis should join the prayer services of the Ahle Hadees, concerning whom is the declaration:

The Wahabis, in the unanimous opinion of the divines of Mecca and Medina, are disbelievers and apostates from Islam, such that anyone who comes to know of their cursed writings and speeches and still doubts in their being disbelievers, himself becomes a disbeliever. It is not permitted to join a prayer service led by any of them. The meat of an animal slaughtered by them is forbidden. Their wives are no longer married to them and these women cannot marry a Muslim or a disbeliever or an apostate. (*Fatawa Sana'iyyah*, Vol. 11, p. 409)

There are scores of other declarations in which the divines of various sects have declared the followers of other sects disbelievers and have forbidden joining in prayer services led by them. In this situation what objection can be taken to the Ahmadis following their own Imam in their prayer services so as to obviate every kind of mischief and disorder.

In approaching these and all similar questions it should be kept in mind that the Ahmadis are those who have accepted the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, in whose person have been fulfilled the prophecies of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and thus they have become *momin*s and are entitled to be described as righteous. A person who denies the truth of one who has been commissioned by God Almighty cannot be called a *momin* and it is obvious that the first condition for a person to lead the prayer service is that he should be a *momin* and righteous. Now if this is the true situation, and the Ahmadis sincerely believe that such is the case, then how can it be required that a *momin* (Ahmadi) should join in prayer services led by a *non-momin* (non-Ahmadi). This situation has been made quite clear by the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, who has said:

Those who, in their haste, have adopted an attitude of ill thinking and are indifferent to the difficulties with which this Movement is faced, have not acted righteously. God Almighty in His Holy Word says:

‘Allah accepts only from the righteous’ (5:28).

This means that it is only the prayer of the righteous that is accepted by God. That is why it has been directed that one should not join a prayer service led by one whose own prayer is not likely to find acceptance. It has ever been the stance of those honored in the faith that a person who opposes the truth is gradually deprived of his faith. He who does not believe in the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him, is a disbeliever, but he who does not accept the Mahdi and Messiah will also lose his faith, and the end is the same. There is first opposition, and finally faith is lost. This is not a small matter but is a matter involving faith and is a question of heaven and hell. To deny me is not merely to reject me but is the

denial of Allah and His Holy Prophet, on whom be the peace and blessings of Allah. He who denies me, before denying me considers God Almighty (God save us) a liar. He sees that internal and external disorders have exceeded the bounds and he conceives that God Almighty, despite His promise:

‘We Ourselves have sent down this Exhortation and We shall surely safeguard it’ (15:10)

has not taken any measure of reform. On the surface he believes that in verse 56 of Chapter 24 of the Holy Quran, God Almighty promised that He would establish a line of successors among the followers of the Holy Prophet as a line of successors was established among the followers of Moses but thinks that (God save us) He has not fulfilled that promise, and there is no Khalifa at present among the followers of the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be on him. Not only this, but such a one will also have to adopt the position that (God save us) it is not true, as the Holy Quran has said, that the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, was a Prophet like Moses, inasmuch as for a perfect resemblance between Moses and the Holy Prophet, it was necessary that at the beginning of the fourteenth century of Islam there should have appeared among the Muslims a Messiah in the same way as in the Mosaic dispensation there came a Messiah in the fourteenth century after Moses. Further, he who denies me would also have to deny the vase of the Holy Quran:

‘And among others from among them who have not yet joined them’ (62:4)

which prophecies the advent of a reflection of Ahmad in the latter days. In the same way there are many verses of the Holy Quran which such a one will have to deny. I go further and claim that he who denies me will have to repudiate the whole of the Holy Quran from beginning to end. Consider, therefore, whether my denial is an easy matter. I do not say on my own authority but call God Almighty to witness that the truth is that he who forsakes me and denies me, even if he does so only by his conduct and not by his tongue, rejects the whole of the Holy Quran and forsakes God. (*Alhakam*, 17 March 1906)

The Holy Quran describes those who reject one sent by God as being dead. How then can one who is alive join in a prayer service led by one who is dead?

The Establishment of a Heavenly Graveyard

One objection that is raised in that the Founder of the Ahmadiyya Movement instituted a heavenly graveyard (*Bahishti Maqbarah*) and that he laid it down that whoever contributed one tenth of his property for the purpose of the Movement would enter Paradise and thus he opened the way to Paradise through a financial contribution.

It should be clearly grasped that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, certainly did not prescribe a financial contribution alone as a means of securing burial in this graveyard. For that purpose he laid down other conditions also such as purity of life and righteousness etc. For instance, he said:

The third condition is that a person who seeks burial in this graveyard should be righteous and should refrain from all that is forbidden and should not indulge in anything which has a smattering of associating others with God or of an innovation. He should be a true and plain Muslim. Every righteous person who possesses no property and can render no financial assistance can be given burial in this graveyard if it is proved that he had devoted his life to the faith and was in every way a righteous ...

It would not be enough to contribute one tenth of moveable and immovable property but it would be necessary that the testator should, as far as is possible for him, act upon Islamic commandments and should strive after righteousness and purity and should have sincere faith in the Holy Prophet and should not contravene the rights of his fellow creatures. (*Al-Wassiyat*, p. 24)

These extracts show clearly that the Promised Messiah, peace be on him, laid it down as conditions for the burial of a person in the heavenly graveyard that he should be a servant of the faith, should be righteous, should be entirely free from any paganism, or indulging in innovations, should be a Muslim, should believe in the Unity of God, should have sincere faith in the Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, and should discharge his obligations towards his fellow creatures.

It is mentioned in the *ahadees* that the Promised Messiah will expound to his followers their grades in Paradise (*Muslim*, chapter on Anti-Christ). This prophecy was, by Divine grace, fulfilled by the institution of the *Bahishti Maqbarah*.

There is nothing objectionable to convey the good news of paradise to people having regard to their conduct and efforts. Prophets in the past have been conveying such good news to people from among their followers. The Holy Prophet, peace and blessings of Allah be upon him, conveyed such good news to those Companions of his who had participated in the Battle of Badr (*Bokahri*, chapter on Battles). Then he conveyed this good news to ten particular Companions who became known as the *Ashrah Mubasharah*. He also instituted a graveyard and named it *Jannatul Baque* which in effect means heavenly graveyard.

The Promised Messiah, peace be on him, in accord with the Divine will and command instituted a graveyard and laid down certain conditions for burial therein which are in accord with the Holy Quran and the *hadees* and announced that whoever fulfilled those conditions would be admitted to Paradise by Divine grace. What objection could there be to that?